arXiv:1511.02410v1 [math.DG] 7 Nov 2015

A CONTINUITY METHOD APPROACH TO THE UNIQUENESS OF KÄHLER-EINSTEIN CONE METRICS

LONG LI AND KAI ZHENG

Abstract. The purpose of this paper is to provide an alternative proof of the uniqueness of Kähler-Einstein metrics with cone singularities. There are three parts and each contains some new ingredients: first, we generalise Matsushima's reducitivity result to conic setting by Hörmander's L^2 technique; second, we construct a Aubin-Yau type continuity path for Kähler cone metrics; third, Bando-Mabuchi's bifurcation technique is explored to this path at Kähler-Einstein cone metrics.

1. Introduction

Let X be a Kähler manifold, D be a hypersurface and L_D be the associated line bundle of D. We denote the regular part by $M := X\backslash D$. We assume the cone angle $0 < \beta \leq 1$. We further assume L_D is positive and $-(K_X + (1-\beta)L_D) > 0$. Consider the Kähler class

$$\Omega = -(K_X + (1-\beta)L_D).$$

The automorphism of the couple (X, D) is an automorphism of X and fixs the divisor D.

A *Kähler cone metric* of cone angle $2\pi\beta$ along D, is a closed positive $(1,1)$ current and a smooth Kähler metric on the regular part M. In a local holomorphic chart $\{U_p; z^1, \dots z^n\}$ around a point $p \in D$, its Kähler form is quasi-isometric to the cone flat metric, which is

$$\omega_{cone} := \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2}\beta^2|z^1|^{2(\beta-1)}dz^1 \wedge dz^{\bar{1}} + \sum_{2\leq j\leq n} dz^j \wedge dz^{\bar{j}}\,.$$

Here $\{z^1, \dots z^n\}$ are the local defining functions of the hypersurface D where p locates.

The space of Kähler cone metrics associated to Ω is non-empty, it contains Donaldson's model metric (see (2.1) later). We say a Kähler cone metric $\omega_\varphi \in \Omega$ is the *Kähler-Einstein cone metric* of cone angle $2\pi\beta$ along D if it satisfies the equation of currents,

$$Ric(\omega_\varphi) = \omega_\varphi + 2\pi(1-\beta)[D].$$

Our main theorem is the uniqueness of the Kähler-Einstein cone metric.

Theorem 1.1. *The Kähler-Einstein cone metric is unique up to automorphisms.*

There are several ways to prove uniqueness results for canonical metrics. In this paper, we will follow Bando-Mabuchi's celebrated work [1] to attack this problem by applying the continuity path, which connects the Kähler-Einstein cone metric ω_φ to a given Kähler cone metric ω. I.e. for any $t \in [0,1]$,

$$Ric(\omega_{\varphi(t)}) = t\omega_{\varphi(t)} + (1-t)\omega + 2\pi(1-\beta)[D].$$

There are three main steps.

Step 1. We generalize Matsushima's reductivity result to Kähler-Einstein cone manifolds (see Theorem 3.1), and here we do not require the Kähler class is parallel to the anti-canonical class. This is equivalent to establish a one-one correspondence between the holomorphic automorphism group and the kernel of certain elliptic operator. One side of it, from automorphism group to the kernel, is proved by solving certain $\bar{\partial}$-equation with Kodaira-Hörmander's L^2 estimate. The other side is proved by contradiction, and we utilise a Bochner type formula (for one forms) in the argument. But unfortunately, the general Bochner formula itself is not clear to be true for Kähler cone metrics by regularity issue.

Remark 1.2. *In* [10]*, Cheltsov-Rubinstein also have a reductivity for the Kähler-Einstein edge metrics, but their method is based on an expansion formula for edge metrics, which is very different from ours.*

Remark 1.3. *For the klt - pair, Chen-Donaldson-Sun* [13] *proved that the automorphism group is reductive. However, they required the uniqueness of weak Kähler-Einstein metrics in their proof. So it cannot be used here and we need a new proof from a different angle.*

Step 2. This step is to establish a continuity path connecting a general Kähler cone metric to our target, i.e. a Kähler-Einstein cone metric. The difficulties are to prove openness and closedness along the path in Donaldson's $C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$ space: here openness on $[0,1)$ follows from a Bochner type formula with contradiction argument in the second part of **Step 1.**. Thus we are able to carry on the implicit function theorem on $[0,1)$ and the apriori estimates on $[0,\tau]$ for a small fixed $\tau > 0$.

Meanwhile, in order to prove closedness on $[\tau,1]$, everything is boiled down to prove the zero order estimate (Section 4.3.1) and the higher order estimates (Section 4.3.2). We first show that the zero order estimate of the continuity path on $[\tau,1]$ requires only the uniform bound of the Sobolev constant, which is proved from an approximation of the continuity path. The approximation would have non-negative Ricci curvature and uniformly bounded diameter. The Evans-Krylov estimate was proved by Calamai and the second author in Proposition 4.6 and 4.7 in [8] with an angle restriction till $\frac{2}{3}$. The proof there was

achieved by proving several estimates of the weak solution (see section 5 in [8] where the proof also covers the cases on manifolds with boundary) including the global boundedness, the local boundedness, the weak Harnack inequality and the Harnack inequality and their correspondences on the boundary. Generally, when the angle is greater than $\frac{2}{3}$, we encourage readers to the remark at the end of section 4.3.2.

Step 3. The bifurcation technique (at $t = 1$) is established under conic setting in this step, and we use it to conclude our theorem after **Step 2.** In fact, this bifurcation technique for Kähler-Einstein (cone) metrics requires the (generalized) Matsushima's theorem. While, the computation of the second variation of the conic $I - J$ functional is more subtle than the smooth case.

Remark 1.4. *The bifurcation method developed in Bando-Mabuchi* [1] *concerns the uniqueness of the smooth Kähler-Einstein metrics. Analogous result is Tian-Zhu* [30] *in the context of Kähler-Ricci soliton.*

We would like to mention that our theorem generalises Bando-Mabuchi's result [1], while fullfills the authors' projects [26][27][8][33]. However, since we only work with simple smooth divisors, it is weaker than the beautiful work of Berndtsson [5], where the uniqueness result for Kähler-Einstein cone metrics with normal crossing type divisors is proved. The main obstruction for our continuity method to reproduce his result is to extend Donaldson's $C^{2,\alpha}_{\beta}$ Schauder estimate for linear equations to normal crossing type divisors. Although it is not written down anywhere yet, this point is believed to be true by many people. We will generalise our uniqueness result in the sub-sequel papers.

Remark 1.5. *We remark that Berman-Boucksom-Eyssidieux-Guedj-Zeriahi in* [2] *extends Berndtsson's result to klt-pairs.*

Finally, since this area is developing rapidly, it would be too ambitious to provide all relevant references, we sincerely apology for this inconvenience and appreciate readers' understanding, as we will try our best to improve it in the sub-sequel papers.

Acknowledgement: We are very grateful to Prof. Xiuxiong Chen. This paper was initiated during his invitation in Stony Brook in 2014. The first author would like to thank Prof. Mihai Păun, for pointing out a mistake in the first version. The first author also wants to thank Prof. Ian Hambleton and Prof. McKenzie Wang for their many supports. The second author would like to thank Prof. Bing Wang for his useful discussions.

2. Kähler cone metrics

Let s be a global meromorphic section of $[D]$ and h be a Hermitian metric on $[D]$. Once we are given a Kähler class Ω, we choose a

smooth Kähler metric ω_0 in it. It is shown in Donaldson [16] that, for sufficiently small $\delta > 0$,

$$\omega_D = \omega_0 + \delta \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2} \partial\bar{\partial} |s|_h^{2\beta} \tag{2.1}$$

is a Kähler cone metric. Moreover, ω_D is independent of the choices of ω_0, h, δ up to quasi-isometry. We call it *model metric* in this paper.

The space of Kähler cone potentials $\mathcal{H}_\beta$ consists of ω_D-psh functions of the Kähler cone metrics in Ω.

Now we present the function spaces which are introduced by Donaldson in [16]. The Hölder space C^α_β consists of those functions f which are Hölder continuous with respect to a Kähler cone metric. Note that according to this definition, for any Kähler cone metric $\omega \in C^\alpha_\beta$, around the point $p \in D$, we have a local normal coordinate such that $g_{ij}(p) = \delta_{ij}$.

Definition 2.1. *The Hölder space $C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$ is defined by*

$$C^{2,\alpha}_\beta = \{ f \mid f, \partial f, \partial\bar{\partial} f \in C^\alpha_\beta \} .$$

Note that the $C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$ space, since it concerns only the mixed derivatives, is different from the usual $C^{2,\alpha}$ Hölder space.

2.1. **Energy functionals.** We denote the volume $V = \Omega^n$. The Aubin functions I and J could be defined on $\mathcal{H}^{1,1}_\beta = C^{1,1}_\beta \cap \mathcal{H}_\beta$ by

$$I_\omega(\varphi) = \frac{1}{V} \int_M \varphi(\omega^n - \omega_\varphi^n) = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \int_M \partial\varphi \wedge \bar{\partial}\varphi \wedge \omega^i \wedge \omega_\varphi^{n-1-i},$$

$$J_\omega(\varphi) = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{i+1}{n+1} \int_M \partial\varphi \wedge \bar{\partial}\varphi \wedge \omega^i \wedge \omega_\varphi^{n-1-i}.$$

Note that the functionals I and J satisfy the inequalities

$$\frac{1}{n+1} I \leq J \leq \frac{n}{n+1} I.$$

The Lagrangian functional of the Monge-Ampère operator is

$$D_\omega(\varphi) = \frac{1}{V} \int_M \varphi\omega^n - J_\omega(\varphi). \tag{2.2}$$

The derivative of D_ω along a general path $\varphi_t \in \mathcal{H}^{1,1}_\beta$ is given by

$$\frac{d}{dt} D_\omega(\varphi_t) = \frac{1}{V} \int_M \dot{\varphi}_t \, \omega_{\varphi_t}^n.$$

We could compute the explicit formula of $D_\omega(\varphi)$ as the following

$$D_\omega(\varphi) = \frac{1}{V}\sum_{i=0}^{n}\frac{n!}{(i+1)!(n-i)!}\int_M \varphi\omega^{n-i}\wedge(\sqrt{-1}\partial\bar\partial\varphi)^i$$

$$= \frac{1}{V}\int_M \varphi\omega^n - \frac{1}{V}\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\frac{i+1}{n+1}\int_M \partial\varphi\wedge\bar\partial\varphi\wedge\omega^i\wedge\omega_\varphi^{n-i-1}. \tag{2.3}$$

Let $\mathcal{H}^0_\beta$ be the subspace of $\mathcal{H}_\beta\cap C^{1,1}_\beta$ with the normalization condition

$$\mathcal{H}^0_\beta := \{\varphi\in\mathcal{H}_\beta\cap C^{1,1}_\beta | D_\omega(\varphi)=0\}.$$

2.2. **Kähler-Einstien cone metrics.** Recall that D is a simple smooth divisor on X. Then suppose the associated line bundle $L_D\geq 0$ is semi-positive, and the anti-canonical line bundle $-K_X$ can be decomposed into

$$-K_X = -(K_X+(1-\beta)L_D)+(1-\beta)L_D.$$

We further assume $-(K_X+(1-\beta)L_D)>0$, and consider the cohomology class of

$$\Omega = -(K_X+(1-\beta)L_D). \tag{2.4}$$

Let $\mathcal{E}$ denote the space of all Kähler-Einstein cone metrics on X, with angle $2\pi\beta$ along the divisor D and has $C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$ Kähler cone potential. Assume that $\mathcal{E}$ is not empty, i.e. there exists a Kähler-Einstein cone metric

$$\omega_\varphi = \omega + i\partial\bar\partial\varphi\in\mathcal{E},$$

with potential $\varphi\in C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$. Note that the Kähler cone potential of a Kähler-Einstein cone metric is $C^{1,1}_\beta$, and indeed $C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$ by the Evans-Krylov estimate of the Kähler-Einstein equation (2.10) with Lemma 2.2.

We can choose ϕ_g be a metric (not a function!) of the $\mathbb{R}$-line bundle $-(K_X+(1-\beta)L_D)$ and write

$$\omega_\varphi = i\partial\bar\partial\phi_g.$$

The metric satisfies the following Monge-Ampère equation:

$$(i\partial\bar\partial\phi_g)^n = e^{-\Phi},\qquad \int_X e^{-\Phi} = c_1(\omega)^n \tag{2.5}$$

where

$$\Phi = \phi_g + (1-\beta)\psi,$$

and

$$\psi = \log|s|^2$$

is a positively curved singular hermitian metric (not a function!) on the line bundle L_D. Notice that the metric ϕ_g is in fact smooth on the regular part M, by applying the bootstrap method to the complex Monge-Ampère equations.

We furthermore discuss and write down the equivalent equations of (2.5). According to the cohomology condition, the metric $e^{-\Phi}$ is exactly a volume form. Hence equation (2.5) makes sense. Thanks to Poincaré-Lelong formula, we have

$$i\partial\bar{\partial}\psi = [D].$$

Hence up to an normalization, equation (2.5) is equivalent to the following:

$$-i\partial\bar{\partial}\log\omega_\varphi^n = i\partial\bar{\partial}\phi_g + (1-\beta)[D].$$

The two sides of this equation are globally defined. And this is equivalent to equation as follwoing, i.e. the Kähler-Einstein cone metric satisfies the equation of currents,

$$Ric(\omega_\varphi) = \omega_\varphi + 2\pi(1-\beta)[D]. \tag{2.6}$$

This equation implies the cohomology relation (2.4).

Using the smooth metric ω_0, we have as follows from the cohomology relation (2.4),

$$Ric(\omega_0) = \omega_0 + i\partial\bar{\partial}\Psi, \tag{2.7}$$

where $\Psi/(1-\beta)$ is a smooth metric on the line bundle L_D. Letting

$$\omega_0 = i\partial\bar{\partial}\phi_0,$$

we have the following identity from equation (2.7).

$$\exp(-\phi_0 - \Psi) = \omega_0^n,$$

then

$$\phi_0 = \phi_g - \varphi + |s|_h^{2\beta}$$

is the metric for the Kähler form ω_0. Then combining (2.6) and (2.7), we have

$$\frac{\omega_\varphi^n}{\omega_0^n} = \frac{e^{-\varphi-\delta|s|_h^{2\beta}+\Psi+(1-\beta)\log h}}{|s|_h^{2-2\beta}}. \tag{2.8}$$

Let h_0 be the smooth function $\Psi + (1-\beta)\log h$. In conclusion, under the smooth background metric ω_0, it becomes

$$\frac{\omega_\varphi^n}{\omega_0^n} = \frac{e^{-\varphi-\delta|s|_h^{2\beta}+h_0}}{|s|_h^{2-2\beta}}. \tag{2.9}$$

We denote

$$\mathfrak{f}_0 = -\log(|s|_h^{2(1-\beta)}) - \delta|s|_h^{2\beta} + h_0.$$

If we use ω as the background metric, the Kähler-Einstein cone metric $\omega_\varphi = \omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi$ satisfies

$$\log\omega_\varphi^n = \log\omega^n - \varphi + \mathfrak{f}. \tag{2.10}$$

Here

$$\mathfrak{f} = \mathfrak{f}_0 - \log\frac{\omega^n}{\omega_0^n} = -\log(\frac{\omega^n}{\omega_0^n}|s|_h^{2(1-\beta)}) - \delta|s|_h^{2\beta} + h_0. \tag{2.11}$$

The estimates of f are useful in the higher order estimates (see Lemma 4.1 in Calamai-Zheng [8]).

Lemma 2.2. *$\mathfrak{f} \in C^{\alpha}_{\beta}$ for any $0 < \beta \leq 1$ and $\alpha \leq \min\{\frac{2}{\beta} - 2, \frac{1}{\beta}\}$. $|\partial \mathfrak{f}|_{\omega}$ is bounded when $0 < \beta < \frac{2}{3}$.*

Remark 2.3. *The lemmas above follow for all normal crossing divisors D.*

3. The automorphism group is reductive

Now let's call $\mathrm{Aut}(X, D)$ as the set of all holomorphic automorphisms of X, which fix the divisor D. And assume G is the identity component of $\mathrm{Aut}(X, D)$. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be the space of all holomorphic vector fields on X tangential to D. Fix a $C^{2,\alpha}_{\beta}$ cone metric θ, and then we can consider its isotropy group K_θ of G. The G-orbit $\mathcal{O}$ through θ in $\mathcal{E}$ can be written as

$$\mathcal{O} \cong G/K_\theta.$$

Take $\mathfrak{k}_\theta$ to be the set all Killing vector fields on X with respect to θ, and $\mathfrak{k}_\theta$ is the Lie sub-algebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ corresponding to K_θ in G. Our goal is to prove the following:

Theorem 3.1. *Let*

$$H_\theta := \{\varphi \in C^{2,\alpha}_{\beta} \cap C^{\infty}(M) |\ \Delta_\theta \varphi = -\varphi\},$$

where Δ_θ is the geometric Laplacian, and M is the complement of D on X. Set $\mathfrak{p}_\theta := \sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{k}_\theta$, and $H^{\mathbb{C}}_\theta := H_\theta \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C}$. Then

(i) *$\mathfrak{k}_\theta = \{Y_{\varphi,\theta} | \varphi \in \sqrt{-1} H_\theta\}$ and $\mathfrak{p}_\theta = \{Y_{\varphi,\theta} | \varphi \in H_\theta\}$.*

(ii) *$\varphi \in H^{\mathbb{C}}_\theta \to Y_{\varphi,\theta} \in \mathfrak{g}$ defines an isomorphism and hence*

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k}_\theta \oplus \mathfrak{p}_\theta.$$

In order to prove above theorem, it is enough to prove the following two statements: first, given a holomorphic vector field v tangential to D, we can create a corresponding element

$$u \in H^{\mathbb{C}}_\theta;$$

second, given an element $u_2 \in H_\theta$, we can induce a holomorphic vector field $v_2 \in \mathfrak{g}$ from u_2. We will prove the first statement by solving a $\bar{\partial}$ equation, and the second statement is proved by applying a Bochner-Kodaira type formula.

3.1. Solving $\bar{\partial}$ equation.

We clarify our notations again. Let

$$\omega_g := \omega_{\varphi_g} = \omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi_g,$$

be a Kähler-Einstein cone metric with angle $2\pi\beta$ along D, with potential φ_g in $C^{2,\alpha}_{\beta}$.

Suppose v is a holomorphic vector field on X in $T^{0,1}(X)$, or equivalently, a holomorphic $(n-1,0)$ form with value in $-K_X$. We define $(n,1)$-form with value in $-K_X$ as

$$f := \omega_g \wedge v$$

and consider the equation:

$$f = \bar{\partial} u. \tag{3.1}$$

In general, it's not easy to handle equation (3.1), even in the L^2 sense. However, we have the following proposition when v is tangential to the divisor. First we claim that f is a closed $(0,1)$-current on X.

Lemma 3.2. *The $(0,1)$-current $f = \omega_g \wedge v$ is $\bar{\partial}$ closed.*

Proof. It's enough to check the following: let U be an open neighborhood around a point $p \in D$, for any smooth $(0, n-2)$ form W such that supp$W \Subset U$, we have

$$\int_X \omega_g \wedge v \wedge \bar{\partial} W = 0.$$

The convolution $\varphi_{g,\varepsilon} = \chi_\varepsilon \star \varphi_g$ converges uniformly to φ_g locally. Hence we have weak convergence as

$$\int_X \omega_{g,\varepsilon} \wedge (v \wedge \bar{\partial} W) \to \int_X \omega_g \wedge (v \wedge \bar{\partial} W).$$

By integration by parts, we have

$$\int_X \bar{\partial}(\omega_{g,\varepsilon} \wedge v) \wedge W = 0,$$

for each ε. And the result follows.

□

We denote $W^{1,2}(\omega_0)$ the $W^{1,2}$ Sobolev space with respect to the smooth Kähler metric ω_0.

Proposition 3.3. *Suppose the holomorphic vector field v is tangential along D. Then there exists a function $u \in C^\infty(M) \cap W^{1,2}(\omega_0)$, such that u solves equation (3.1), and the following estimate holds:*

$$\int_X |u|^2 e^{-\Phi} \leq \int_X H e^{-\Phi}, \tag{3.2}$$

where $H = |f|_{i\partial\bar{\partial}\phi_g}$ is the L^2 norm of f under the metric ω_g.

Proof. We can write $v = X^i d\hat{z}^i$ locally, where $d\hat{z}^i$ is an $(n-1,0)$ form defined by

$$dz^i \wedge d\hat{z}^i := dz^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dz^n = dZ,$$

and X^i is a holomorphic function with value in $-K_X$. Then

$$\omega_g \wedge v = (X^\alpha g_{\alpha\bar{\beta}}) d\bar{z}^\beta \wedge dZ$$

is an $(n,1)$ form with value in $-K_X$ (note that those coefficients may differ by a sign, but we ignore this problem here since we only concern about L^p norms).

Notice that, from Lemma 3.2, $\bar{\partial} f = 0$ on X shows that

$$f = \omega_g \wedge v$$

is a $\bar{\partial}$ closed $(0,1)$ form, and X is in fact a projective manifold by the ampleness of $-K_X$. Then the result follows from a slightly general version [6] of Hörmander's L^2 estimate [3], and it's enough to check two things: f is in $L^2_{loc,(0,1)}$ and $H \in L^\infty_{loc}$ satisfies

$$f \wedge \overline{f} \leq H i\partial\bar{\partial}\Phi, \tag{3.3}$$

in the sense of currents of order zero (measure coefficients).

These conditions are true thanks to the vanishing of the orthogonal direction of v near the divisor. In fact, we can decompose $X^1 = s \cdot h$ near the divisor D, where $D = \{s = 0\}$ and h is a local holomorphic function. Then we can check the growth order of f near D as:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\overline{1}} &= X^1 g_{1\overline{1}} + \sum_{j>1} X^j g_{j\overline{1}} \\ &\sim r^{2\beta-1} + r^{\beta-1}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

and for $k > 1$

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\overline{k}} &= X^1 g_{1\overline{k}} + \sum_{j>1} X^j g_{j\overline{k}} \\ &\sim r^{\beta}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

where $|z^1| = r$. Hence we have $f \in L^2_{loc}$ and $H \in L^\infty_{loc}$, since

$$|f|^2_{\omega_g} \leq C |f|^2_{\omega_D},$$

where ω_D is the model cone Kähler metric, and the latter is bounded since

$$r^{2-2\beta} |f_{\overline{1}}|^2 \sim O(1) \text{ and } |f_{\overline{k}}|^2 \sim O(1).$$

Finally notice that $i\partial\bar{\partial}\Phi$ can be written as

$$i\partial\bar{\partial}\Phi = i\partial\bar{\partial}\phi_g + (1-\beta)\delta_D,$$

where δ_D is the integration current of D. Therefore we can establish the inequality:

$$f \wedge \overline{f} \leq H i\partial\bar{\partial}\phi_g = H i\partial\bar{\partial}\Phi, \tag{3.6}$$

on M by definition of H. However, the coefficients of $f \wedge \overline{f}$ has no mass on the divisor D since f is L^2_{loc}. Hence inequality (3.5) actually holds on the whole X.

□

Remark 3.4. *In fact, we can solve the $\bar{\partial}$ equation (3.1) with estimate (3.2) under even weaker conditions, provided that inequality (3.3) still holds in the sense of complex measure coefficients positive $(1,1)$ currents, and the integral on the RHS of equation (3.2) is finite.*

Next let's consider the complex Laplacian operator $\Box_g$ defined with respect to the Kähler-Einstein cone metric ω_g. It can be written as

$$\Box_g u := -g^{\overline{\beta}\alpha}\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial z^\alpha \partial \overline{z}^\beta} = -\triangle_{\omega_g},$$

in a local coordinate system. It certainly makes sense to define it outside of the divisor D, and it also makes sense across the divisor when u is merely in $C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$.

Now we can look at this operator in a different view of point. We are given a C^α_β Kähler cone metric ω. We say a form f in $L^2(\omega,\Phi)$, if

$$\int_X |f|^2_\omega \cdot e^{-\Phi} \text{ is finite.}$$

Define $\bar{\partial}$ operator as a closed, densely defined operator between two Hilbert spaces, with closed range property. That is to say

$$\bar{\partial} : L^2_{(n,0)}(\omega,\Phi) \dashrightarrow L^2_{(n,1)}(\omega,\Phi),$$

where Φ is viewed as a positively curved singular Hermitian metric on the anti-canonical line bundle $-K_X$. Then there exists its adjoint operator

$$\bar{\partial}^*_{\Phi,\omega} : L^2_{(n,1)}(\omega,\Phi) \dashrightarrow L^2_{(n,0)}(\omega,\Phi),$$

which is also a closed, densely defined operator with closed range. However, there is another way to define the formal adjoint operator of $\bar{\partial}$, by doing integration by parts in local coordinate systems.

It can be written as, for any $-K_X$ valued $(n,1)$ form f,

$$\vartheta f = \partial^\Phi(\omega \lrcorner f),$$

in the distributional sense, and the operator ∂^Φ is defined as

$$\partial^\Phi \cdot := e^\Phi(\partial e^{-\Phi}\cdot) = \partial - \partial\Phi \wedge \cdot. \tag{3.7}$$

It's standard to show $\bar{\partial}^*_{\Phi,\omega} = \vartheta$ on the domain of $\bar{\partial}^*_{\Phi,\omega}$. Therefore we can abuse them and define the other second order elliptic operator as

$$\Box_{\Phi,\omega} u := \bar{\partial}^*_{\Phi,\omega}\bar{\partial} u = \partial^\Phi(\omega \lrcorner \bar{\partial} u). \tag{3.8}$$

If we put the metric $\omega = \omega_g$, then a quick observation [26] is that these two operators $\Box_g$ and $\Box_{\Phi,\omega_g}$ coincides with each other on M. Hence we can translate the Laplacian equation into two first order equations:

$$\begin{cases} \omega_g \wedge v &= \bar{\partial} u \\ \partial^\Phi v &= \Box_g u, \end{cases} \tag{3.9}$$

where in prior, v is a vector field on M.

However, the operator $\Box_{\Phi,\omega_g}$ is not quite well defined as a global operator, since it's not clear that $\bar{\partial}$ operator has closed range in the L^2 space with singular metric ω_g (it's proved by the Bochner technique, which involves one derivative of the metric ω_g). The key observation here is that the operator ∂^Φ, defined in equation (3.7), is independent of the metric ω. Then it still makes sense to talk about the system of differential equations like (3.9) on the whole manifold X in the current sense, and we are going to consider it in a very special circumstance.

Lemma 3.5. *Under the same conditions in Proposition 3.3, the following equation holds on X:*

$$\partial^\Phi v = u + C, \tag{3.10}$$

where C is some normalization constant. In particular, the function u is in $C^{\bar{1},\alpha}_\beta$, i.e. $u \in C^\alpha_\beta$ and $\bar{\partial} u \in C^\alpha_\beta$.

Proof. First note that outside the divisor D, we can write equation (3.1) as

$$\partial\bar{\partial}\Phi \wedge v = \bar{\partial} u.$$

Then by the commutation relation $\partial^\Phi\bar{\partial} + \bar{\partial}\partial^\Phi = \partial\bar{\partial}\Phi$, we derive the following $\bar{\partial}$ equation on M:

$$\bar{\partial}(\partial^\Phi v - u) = 0. \tag{3.11}$$

The difference $\xi = \partial^\Phi v - u$ is a holomorphic function outside the divisor. Then a standard theorem (Lemma 1.1, Lecture 5 [3]) implies that ξ can be extended across the divisor D, provided $\partial^\Phi v$ and u are in L^2_{loc}. The norm $||u||_{L^2}$ is bounded thanks to the L^2 estimate (3.2), and notice that we can compute $\partial\Phi$ on M as:

$$\partial\Phi = \partial\phi_g + (1-\beta)\frac{\partial s}{s}.$$

But $h = \frac{X^1}{z^1}$ is a local holomorphic function near a point on the divisor. Hence the following equation holds on all of X:

$$\partial\Phi \wedge v = \partial\phi_g \wedge v + (1-\beta)\frac{\partial s}{s} \wedge v. \tag{3.12}$$

Now we can write

$$\partial^\Phi v = F - \partial\phi_g \wedge v,$$

where F is a holomorphic function. In particular, $\partial^\Phi v$ is in L^2, and we even have a better regularity. The singular term can be decomposed as follows:

$$\partial\phi_g \wedge v = (X^1\frac{\partial\phi_g}{\partial z^1} + \sum_{j>1} X^j\frac{\partial\phi_g}{\partial z^j})dZ. \tag{3.13}$$

The sum on the RHS of above equation is a smooth function, and the first term has the following growth control near the divisor:

$$X^1\frac{\partial\phi_g}{\partial z^1}\sim r^\beta o(1);\qquad \bar\partial(X^1\frac{\partial\phi_g}{\partial z^1})=X^1\bar\partial(\frac{\partial\phi_g}{\partial z^1})\sim r^{2\beta-1}O(1). \tag{3.14}$$

Hence, $\partial^\Phi v$ is in C^α_β and $\bar\partial\partial^\Phi v$ is in C^α_β. Finally, this shows the difference ξ is a global holomorphic function on X, which can only be a constant. □

Next we claim that the function u constructed in Proposition 3.3 is in the eigenspace Λ_1 of the Laplacian operator Δ_g with eigenvalue 1 (the smallest eigenvalue). To see this, we first need a normalization condition:

$$\int_X u\cdot e^{-\Phi}=0. \tag{3.15}$$

There are two ways to look at this equation: first, u is a $-K_X$ valued $(n,0)$ form, which is exactly a function on X, and $e^{-\Phi}$ is a volume form, so the integral makes sense; second, it is equivalent to write equation (3.15) as

$$\int_X u\wedge\overline{U}e^{-\Phi}=0,$$

where U is a $-K_X$ valued $(n,0)$ form, which is the representative of the constant function 1 on X. Then $e^{-\Phi}$ is viewed as the metric on the anti-canonical line bundle $-K_X$, and equation (3.15) really says that u is orthogonal to the kernel of $\bar\partial$ operator under the weight $e^{-\Phi}$. Based on this normalization, we have the following lemma:

Lemma 3.6. *Under the same conditions in Proposition 3.3. If we normalize the function u as equation (3.15), i.e. $u\perp_\Phi\ker\bar\partial$, then the constant C appearing in Lemma 3.5 is zero.*

Proof. It's enough to prove the following identity:

$$\int_X\partial(ve^{-\Phi})=\int_X(\partial v-\partial\Phi\wedge v)e^{-\Phi}=0. \tag{3.16}$$

Let's first consider a smooth approximation sequence of Φ:

$$\Phi_\varepsilon=\phi_g+(1-\beta)\log(|s|^2+\varepsilon e^\psi),$$

where ψ is a smooth positively curved metric on the line bundle L_D. Then we know Φ_ε is decreasing to Φ, and $i\partial\bar\partial\Phi_\varepsilon\geq\omega_g$ [27]. Now it's trivial to see

$$\int_X\partial(ve^{-\Phi_\varepsilon})=0.$$

Then we claim the integrals will converge to $\int_X\partial v\cdot e^{-\Phi}$. Notice that we can write the integral as

$$\int_X\partial(ve^{-\Phi_\varepsilon})=\int_X\partial v\cdot e^{-\Phi_\varepsilon}-\int_X\partial\phi_g\wedge ve^{-\Phi_\varepsilon}-\int_X\partial\log(|s|^2+\varepsilon e^\psi)\wedge ve^{-\Phi_\varepsilon}. \tag{3.17}$$

The first two terms on the RHS of above equation will converges to

$$\int_X (\partial v - \partial\phi_g \wedge v) \cdot e^{-\Phi},$$

by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem. But the third term is the tricky part here.

$$\begin{aligned} \partial \log(|s|^2 + \varepsilon e^{\psi}) \wedge v e^{-\Phi_\varepsilon} &= \frac{\overline{s}\partial s + \varepsilon \partial\psi e^{\psi}}{(|s|^2 + \varepsilon e^{\psi})} \wedge v e^{-\Phi_\varepsilon} \\ &= \frac{\overline{s}\partial s \wedge v e^{-\phi_g}}{(|s|^2 + \varepsilon e^{\psi})^{2-\beta}} + \frac{\varepsilon e^{\psi}\partial\psi \wedge v e^{-\phi_g}}{(|s|^2 + \varepsilon e^{\psi})^{2-\beta}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

The first term in the last line of equation (3.18) is safe since

$$\partial s \wedge v = s \cdot h$$

for some holomorphic function h locally near the divisor. For the second term, it's enough to estimate it locally in the orthogonal direction to the divisor D. For $z^1 \in \mathbb{C}$, we can compute the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|z^1|<1} \frac{\varepsilon dz^1 \wedge d\bar{\zeta}}{(|z^1|^2 + \varepsilon)^{2-\beta}} &= c\varepsilon \int_0^1 \frac{r dr}{(r^2 + \varepsilon)^{2-\beta}} \\ &= c\varepsilon(\varepsilon^{\beta-1} + O(1)) \\ &\sim \varepsilon^{\beta}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

where $r = |z^1|$ and c is some uniform constant. Hence the second term converges to zero when $\varepsilon \to 0$, which implies the convergence of the integral, i.e.

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \int_X \partial(v \cdot e^{-\Phi_\varepsilon}) = \int_X \partial(v \cdot e^{-\Phi}) = 0.$$

□

Remark 3.7. *It's easy to see that equation (3.16) holds locally near the divisor, by considering this integration on a sequence of subdomains defined as $D_\varepsilon = \{|s| > \varepsilon\}$. However, this integration by parts argument can not be directly applied to our situation. This is because, on the one hand, the defining function $|s|$ is not well defined globally; on the other hand, $\nabla|s|_h$ will generate non-parallel directions to the tangential direction of the divisor.*

Now if we combine Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.6, then outside the divisor D, the function u satisfies

$$\Box_g u = u.$$

That is to say, the function u is in fact an eigenfunction of $\Box_g$ with smallest eigenvalue 1 outside the divisor.

Lemma 3.8. *Let ω_g be a Kähler-Einstein cone metric with angle $2\pi\beta$ along a smooth divisor D. Suppose $u \in C^{\alpha}_{\beta}$ is a function such that the following things hold:*

$$\Box_{\omega_g} u = u,$$

on M, and

$$\int_X |u|^2 e^{-\Phi} < C, \tag{3.20}$$

with

$$\int_X |\nabla u|^2_{\omega_g} e^{-\Phi} < C, \tag{3.21}$$

where the norm for the $(0,1)$ form is taken with respect to the cone metric ω_g. Then u is in $C^{2,\alpha}_{\beta}$.

Proof. We will only sketch the proof here. From (3.20) and (3.21), Section 5 in [8] implies that u is a $W^{1,2}$ weak solution. Then the Harnack inequality, Proposition 5.12 proved in [8], implies that u has bounded C^{α} norm. Thus the conclusion follows from applying Donaldson's $C^{2,\alpha}_{\beta}$ Schauder estimate to the equation $\Box_{\omega_g} u = u$.

□

Observe that inequality (3.20) is equivalent to say $u \in L^2(\Phi)$, which is guaranteed by the Hörmander's estimate (Proposition 3.3). Moreover, the condition $\nabla u \in L^2(\omega_g, \Phi)$ is also true by the following lemma.

Lemma 3.9. *The function u constructed in Proposition 3.3 satisfies*

$$\int_X |\bar{\partial} u|^2_{\omega_g} e^{-\Phi} < +\infty, \tag{3.22}$$

and

$$\int_X |\partial u|^2_{\omega_g} e^{-\Phi} < +\infty. \tag{3.23}$$

In particular, $u \in C^{2,\alpha}_{\beta}$.

Proof. First observe that for any $(0,1)$ form α, the two norms $|\alpha|^2_{\omega_g}$ and $|\alpha|^2_{\omega_D}$ are equivalent locally near a point on the divisor, where ω_D is the standard model cone metric, by the isometric property between these two metrics. Now we have seen in the proof of Proposition 3.3 that

$$|u_{,\overline{1}}| \sim r^{\beta - 1} \text{ and } |u_{,\overline{k}}| \sim r^{\beta} \text{ for } k > 1.$$

Then we have

$$|\bar{\partial} u|^2_{\omega_D} = r^{2-2\beta} |u_{,\overline{1}}|^2 + \sum_{k>1} |u_{,\overline{k}}|^2 \sim O(1). \tag{3.24}$$

Hence $\bar{\partial}u \in L^2(\omega_g, \Phi)$. Next noticed that those derivatives on the tangential directions are all in $L^2(\omega_g, \Phi)$. This is because locally we can write for all $k > 1$

$$\int \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \overline{z}^k}\right) \overline{\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \overline{z}^k}\right)} \frac{1}{|z^1|^{2-2\beta}} = \int \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial z^k}\right) \overline{\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial z^k}\right)} \frac{1}{|z^1|^{2-2\beta}}, \tag{3.25}$$

by Fubini's theorem and a convolution argument (compare to Theorem 4.2.5, Hörmander [21]). Then the lemma will follow if we can prove $|u_{,1}| \in L^2$, since

$$|\partial u|^2_{\omega_D} = r^{2-2\beta}|u_{,1}|^2 + \sum_{k>1} |u_{,k}|^2.$$

But this is true since $u \in W^{1,2}(\omega_0)$. □

All in all, we conclude as follows.

Theorem 3.10. *Suppose there exists a holomorphic vector field v tangential to the divisor D. Then the function $u \in C^{2,\alpha}_{\beta}$ constructed in Proposition 3.3 satisfies the following equation on X (interpreted as the linear system (3.9)):*

$$\Box_g u = u. \tag{3.26}$$

In particular, u is in the eigenspace Λ_1 of the Laplacian operator Δ_g with eigenvalue 1.

3.2. **Creating the holomorphic vector field.** The remaining task is to prove a theorem "going backwards". That is to say, to create a holomorphic vector field from a real valued egienfunction u_2 in the eigenspace Λ_1. When u_2 is chosen as the imaginary part of the function u in Theorem 3.10, this implies the automorphism group is the complexification of the group of Killing vector fields, i.e. $\mathrm{Aut}(X, D) = K^{\mathbb{C}}$. Then it is reductive.

For any $u \in \Lambda_1$, let's write $u = u_1 + \sqrt{-1}u_2$, where u_1 and u_2 are real valued functions. We see u_1 and u_2 also satisfy equation (3.26) on M, since the Laplacian operator $\Box_g$ is a real operator for the Kähler-Einstein cone metric ω_g. Then the following system of differential equations holds for the function u_2 on M:

$$\begin{cases} \omega_g \wedge v_2 &= \bar{\partial} u_2 \\ \partial^{\Phi} v_2 &= u_2, \end{cases} \tag{3.27}$$

Now we want prove the following theorem.

Theorem 3.11. *The vector field v_2 is a holomorphic vector field tangential to the divisor D.*

First notice that v_2 has L^2 coefficients. This is because $\bar{\partial}u_2 \in L^2$, and locally in a normal coordinate around an arbitrary point $p \in M$,

we have

$$\begin{aligned} |v_2|^2(p) &= h_{\alpha\overline{\mu}} g^{\overline{\beta}\alpha} u_{2,\overline{\beta}} g^{\overline{\mu}\gamma} u_{2,\gamma} \\ &= \sum_{\alpha} \frac{1}{\lambda_\alpha^2} |u_{,\overline{\alpha}}|^2 \\ &\leq c^{-2} \sum_{\alpha} |u_{,\overline{\alpha}}|^2, \end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

where we used the inequality $\omega_g \geq c\omega$. Then observe that $\partial^\Phi v_2 \in L^2$ by the second equation of (3.27). In fact, we can gain more regularities of v_2 from u as follows

Lemma 3.12. *$u_2 \in C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$. In particular, $v_2 \in L^2(\omega_g, \Phi)$ and $\partial^\Phi v \in L^2(\Phi)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.9, $u \in L^2(\Phi)$ and $\nabla u \in L^2(\omega_g, \Phi)$, which implies $u_2 \in L^2(\Phi)$ and $\nabla u_2 \in L^2(\omega_g, \Phi)$. Hence $u_2 \in C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$ by Lemma 3.8. □

However, the true obstruction is that we don't know the growth of $\bar\partial v_2$ (even L^2 is unclear!) near the divisor, where the third derivatives of the potential are involved.

3.3. **Cut-off function.** In order to circumvent this problem, we need to invoke a useful cut off function (Lemma 2.2 [4]). First let

$$\eta : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$$

be an auxiliary function, which is a non-decreasing smooth function such that $\eta = 0$ when $x < 1$ and $\eta = 1$ for $x > 2$ with $|\eta'|$ and $|\eta''|$ bounded. Then define for any $\varepsilon > 0$ small,

$$\rho_\varepsilon := \eta(\varepsilon \log(-\log |s|_h^2)), \tag{3.29}$$

where $h = e^{-\psi}$, a smooth positively curved hermitian metric on the line bundle L_D, and we can always normalize $|s|_h^2 < 1$ on X. For the convenience of readers, we compute its derivatives as follows.

Lemma 3.13. *Let $\tau = |s|^2 e^{-\psi}$ be the L^2 norm of the section. On M, we can write*

$$\bar\partial \rho_\varepsilon = \frac{\varepsilon \eta'}{\log \tau} \overline{\left(\frac{\partial^\psi s}{s} \right)}, \tag{3.30}$$

and

$$\partial\bar\partial \rho_\varepsilon = -\varepsilon\eta' \frac{\partial\bar\partial\psi}{\log\tau} + (\varepsilon^2\eta'' - \varepsilon\eta') \left| \frac{\partial^\psi s}{s \log \tau} \right|^2. \tag{3.31}$$

In particular, $||\bar\partial\rho_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\omega_0)} \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

Proof. Let $K = \log \tau$, and it derivative is

$$\partial K = \frac{\overline{s}\partial(se^{-\psi})}{|s|^2 e^{-\psi}} = \frac{\partial^{\psi} s}{s}. \tag{3.32}$$

The function ρ_ε can be written as

$$\rho_\varepsilon = \eta(\varepsilon \log(-\log \tau)).$$

Hence take $\bar{\partial}$, we have

$$\bar{\partial}\rho_\varepsilon = \eta' \varepsilon \frac{\bar{\partial} K}{K} = \frac{\varepsilon \eta'}{K} \overline{\left(\frac{\partial^{\psi} s}{s}\right)},$$

which proved equation (3.30). Take ∂ again, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial\bar{\partial}\rho_\varepsilon &= \partial(\varepsilon\eta' \frac{1}{K} \overline{\left(\frac{\partial^{\psi} s}{s}\right)}) \\ &= \eta''\varepsilon^2 \frac{1}{K^2} \left(\frac{\partial^{\psi} s}{s}\right) \wedge \overline{\left(\frac{\partial^{\psi} s}{s}\right)} + \eta'\varepsilon\partial \left(\frac{1}{K} \overline{\left(\frac{\partial^{\psi} s}{s}\right)}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.33}$$

Compute the last term as

$$\begin{aligned} \partial \left(\frac{1}{K} \overline{\left(\frac{\partial^{\psi} s}{s}\right)}\right) &= -\frac{1}{K^2} \frac{\partial^{\psi} s}{s} \wedge \overline{\left(\frac{\partial^{\psi} s}{s}\right)} + \frac{1}{K} \overline{\left(\frac{\bar{\partial}\partial^{\psi} s}{s}\right)} \\ &= -\frac{1}{K^2} \frac{\partial^{\psi} s}{s} \wedge \overline{\left(\frac{\partial^{\psi} s}{s}\right)} + \frac{1}{K} \overline{\partial\bar{\partial}\psi}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.34}$$

where we used the commutation relation

$$\partial\bar{\partial}\psi = \bar{\partial}\partial^{\psi} + \partial^{\psi}\bar{\partial}$$

in the last equation. Combine equations (3.33) and (3.34), we proved equation (3.31). And the convergence follows easily, since locally on the orthogonal direction,

$$\partial\rho_\varepsilon \wedge \bar{\partial}\rho_\varepsilon \sim \varepsilon^2 \omega_P,$$

where ω_P stands for the Poincáre metric on the unit disk, which always has a finite volume. □

The cut off function ρ_ε is supported on a small neighborhood

$$D_\varepsilon = \{|s|_h^2 < \exp(-e^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}})\}$$

of the divisor, equals to 1 on $D_{\varepsilon/2}$. Of course the support converges to the divisor when $\varepsilon \to 0$.

Before using these cut off functions to construct an approximation, let's first assume that there is sequence of smooth vector fields v_ε, such that they belong to the following family.

$$\mathcal{V}_\varepsilon := \{v \ ; \bar{\partial} v \wedge \omega_g = 0 \ and \ v = 0 \ on \ D_\varepsilon\}. \tag{3.35}$$

Then we have the following integration by parts formula for such vector fields.

Lemma 3.14. *If $v_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{V}_\varepsilon$, then*

$$\int_X |\bar\partial v_\varepsilon|^2_{\omega_g} e^{-\Phi} = \int_X |\partial^\Phi v_\varepsilon|^2 e^{-\Phi} - \int_X \omega_g \wedge v_\varepsilon \wedge \overline{v}_\varepsilon e^{-\Phi}. \tag{3.36}$$

Proof. The observation is that Φ or $\partial\Phi$ only have singularities along the divisor D. Hence integration by parts works for free, provided one of the integrand is identically zero in a neighborhood of D. Then we compute as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} -\int_X \bar\partial v_\varepsilon \wedge \overline{\bar\partial v_\varepsilon} e^{-\Phi} &= \int_X v_\varepsilon \wedge \overline{\partial^\Phi \bar\partial v_\varepsilon} e^{-\Phi} \\ &= \int_X v_\varepsilon \wedge \overline{(\omega_g \wedge v_\varepsilon - \bar\partial \partial^\Phi v_\varepsilon)} e^{-\Phi} \\ &= \int_X \partial^\Phi v_\varepsilon \wedge \overline{\partial^\Phi v_\varepsilon} e^{-\Phi} - \int_X \omega_g \wedge v_\varepsilon \wedge \overline{v}_\varepsilon e^{-\Phi}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.37}$$

The first line holds because $\bar\partial v_\varepsilon$ is zero on D_ε, and the last line is because v_ε vanishes on D_ε. Then by the assumption, $\bar\partial v_\varepsilon$ is primitive with respect to the metric ω_g, which implies

$$|\bar\partial v_\varepsilon|^2_{\omega_g} = -\bar\partial v_\varepsilon \wedge \overline{\bar\partial v_\varepsilon}.$$

□

Now if we put $\chi_\varepsilon = 1 - \rho_\varepsilon$, then there are two nature ways of approximating:

$$u_\varepsilon = \chi_\varepsilon u_2,$$

or

$$v_\varepsilon = \chi_\varepsilon v_2.$$

Let's look at the first approximation $u_\varepsilon = (1-\rho_\varepsilon)u_2$, and we can define

$$w_\varepsilon = \uparrow^{\omega_g} \bar\partial u_\varepsilon.$$

Then w_ε is indeed in $\mathcal{V}_\varepsilon$, and

$$\partial^\Phi w_\varepsilon = \Box_g u_\varepsilon.$$

Hence Lemma 4.8 implies

$$\int_X |\bar\partial w_\varepsilon|^2_{\omega_g} e^{-\Phi} = \int_X (|\Box_g u_\varepsilon|^2 - |\bar\partial u_\varepsilon|^2) e^{-\Phi}. \tag{3.38}$$

However, the growth of the Laplacian of the cut off function ρ_ε is too fast near the divisor. ($\Delta_g \rho_\varepsilon \sim \varepsilon r^{-2\beta} (\log r)^{-2}$, which is in L^2 only when $\beta < 1/2$ and never in $L^2(\Phi)$!). From now on, we assume

$$v_\varepsilon = \chi_\varepsilon v_2 \in \mathcal{V}_\varepsilon.$$

Then let's invoke the following Bochner type identity for (n, q) forms with value in certain line bundle L, which goes back to Siu, and reformulated by Berndtsson [3]. Recall that ω_0 is smooth Kähler metric.

Definition 3.15. *Let α, β be two differential forms with bidegree (n,q) with value in a line bundle L. Then*

$$T_\alpha := c_{n-1}\gamma_\alpha \wedge \overline{\gamma}_\alpha \wedge \omega_0^{q-1} e^{-\phi}, \tag{3.39}$$

where $c_{n-1} = i^{(n-q)^2}$ is a constant to make $T_\alpha \geq 0$, and γ_α is the unique $(n-q,0)$ form associated to α such that

$$\gamma_\alpha \wedge \omega_0^q = \alpha.$$

Lemma 3.16. *The following identity holds.*

$$\begin{aligned} i\partial\bar{\partial}T_\alpha &= i\partial\bar{\partial}\phi \wedge T_\alpha - 2\,\mathrm{Re}\langle i\bar{\partial}\bar{\partial}^*_\phi\alpha, \alpha\rangle \\ &+ |\bar{\partial}\gamma_\alpha|^2_{\omega_0} - |\bar{\partial}\alpha|^2_{\omega_0} + |\bar{\partial}^*_\phi\alpha|^2_{\omega_0}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.40}$$

Now if we take $\phi = \Phi$ and $\omega = \omega_g$, then $i\partial\bar{\partial}\phi = \omega_g$ by Kähler-Einstein condition on M. The observation again is that integration by parts works on this identity, for all objects vanishing in a neighborhood of the divisor(compare to Lemma 4.8). Therefore, we have the following integral equation.

Proposition 3.17. *Suppose α is any $(n,1)$ form with value in $-K_X$, such that α vanishes in an open neighborhood D_ε of the divisor. Then*

$$\int_X |\alpha|^2_{\omega_g} + \int_X |\bar{\partial}\gamma_\alpha|^2_{\omega_g} = \int_X |\bar{\partial}\alpha|^2_{\omega_g} + |\bar{\partial}^*_\Phi\alpha|^2_{\omega_g}. \tag{3.41}$$

The hope is to apply this Bochner formula to the form $\alpha = \omega_g \wedge v_\varepsilon$. Then we can estimate the L^2 norm of $\bar{\partial}v_\varepsilon$, but there are some error terms on the RHS of equation (3.41). Fortunately, they are negligible in the following sense.

Lemma 3.18. *$v_\varepsilon \to v_2$ in $L^2(\omega_g, \Phi)$ norm, and $\partial^\Phi v_\varepsilon \to \partial^\Phi v_2$ in both $L^2(\omega_0)$ and $L^2(\Phi)$ norm. In particular, $||\partial\rho_\varepsilon \wedge v_2||_{L^2(\Phi)} \to 0$.*

Proof. It's easy to see $||v_\varepsilon - v_2||_{L^2(\omega_g,\Phi)}$ converges to zero when ε decreases to zero, since it's controlled by $||\chi_{D_\varepsilon} v_2||_{L^2(\omega_g,\Phi)}$, and the measure of its support D_ε converges to zero. The latter is also true, since

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^\Phi(v_2 - v_\varepsilon) &= \partial(\rho_\varepsilon v_2) - \partial\Phi \wedge (\rho_\varepsilon v_2) \\ &= \partial\rho_\varepsilon \wedge v_2 + \rho_\varepsilon(\partial v_2 - \partial\Phi \wedge v_2) \\ &= \partial\rho_\varepsilon \wedge v_2 + \rho_\varepsilon u_2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.42}$$

Hence

$$||\partial^\Phi(v_2 - v_\varepsilon)||_{L^2(\omega_0)} \to 0,$$

by Lemma 3.13. Now we may take a closer look at the term $\partial\rho_\varepsilon \wedge v_2$. By Lemma 3.13 again, we can write

$$\partial\rho_\varepsilon \wedge v_2 = \frac{\varepsilon\eta'}{\log\tau}\left(\frac{\partial s}{s} \wedge v_2 - \partial\psi \wedge v_2\right). \tag{3.43}$$

Put $v_2 = X^1 d\hat{z}^1 + \sum_{k>1} X^k d\hat{z}^k$ locally, we have for $j > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} X^j &= g^{j\overline{1}}\bar{\partial}_1 u_2 + \sum_{k>1} g^{j\overline{k}}\bar{\partial}_k u_2 \\ &\sim r^{1-\beta}\cdot r^{\beta-1} + O(1) \\ &\sim O(1). \end{aligned} \tag{3.44}$$

Then the only singular term is

$$\frac{\partial s \wedge v_2}{s \log \tau} = \frac{X^1}{r \log r}, \tag{3.45}$$

where $r = |z^1|$. But

$$\begin{aligned} X^1 &= g^{1\overline{1}}\bar{\partial}_1 u_2 + \sum_{k>1} g^{1\overline{k}}\bar{\partial}_k u_2 \\ &\sim r^{2-2\beta}\cdot r^{\beta-1} + r^{1-\beta}\cdot O(1) \\ &\sim r^{1-\beta}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.46}$$

where we used the condition $u_2 \in C^{2,\alpha}_{\beta}$. Finally,

$$|\partial\rho_\varepsilon \wedge v_2|^2 e^{-\Phi} \sim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^2(\log r)^2}, \tag{3.47}$$

whose L^1 norm converges to zero when $\varepsilon \to 0$. □

Lemma 3.19. *$\bar{\partial}\rho_\varepsilon \wedge \bar{\partial} u_2 \to 0$ in $L^2_{(n,2)}(\omega_g, \Phi)$.*

Proof. Since ω_g is isometric to the model cone metric ω_D, it's enough to prove locally near the divisor

$$||\bar{\partial}\rho_\varepsilon \wedge \bar{\partial} u_2||_{L^2(\omega_D,\Phi)} \to 0. \tag{3.48}$$

We can compute it as

$$\bar{\partial}\rho_\varepsilon \wedge \bar{\partial} u_2 = \sum_{j<k} (\rho_{,\overline{k}} u_{,\overline{j}} - u_{,\overline{k}}\rho_{,\overline{j}}) d\overline{z}^j \wedge d\overline{z}^k.$$

Put $A_{\overline{jk}} = \rho_{,\overline{k}} u_{,\overline{j}} - u_{,\overline{k}}\rho_{,\overline{j}}$ locally, and then we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{\partial}\rho_\varepsilon \wedge \bar{\partial} u_2|^2_{\omega_\beta} e^{-\Phi} &= e^{-\Phi} \sum_{j<k,m<l} g_\beta^{\overline{jm}} g_\beta^{\overline{kl}} A_{\overline{jk}} \overline{A_{\overline{ml}}} \\ &= e^{-\Phi}\Big(\sum_{k>1} r^{2-2\beta}|A_{\overline{1k}}|^2 + \sum_{j>1} r^{2-2\beta}|A_{\overline{j1}}|^2 + \sum_{1<j<k} |A_{\overline{jk}}|^2\Big) \\ &\sim \sum_{k>1} |A_{\overline{1k}}|^2 + \sum_{j>1} |A_{\overline{j1}}|^2 + r^{2\beta-2} \sum_{1<j<k} |A_{\overline{jk}}|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.49}$$

Now note that $\bar{\partial}\rho_\varepsilon = \frac{\varepsilon\eta'}{\log\tau}\left(\frac{\partial \overline{s}}{\overline{s}} - \bar{\partial}\psi\right)$, which implies for any $k > 1$

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\overline{1k}} &= \rho_{,\overline{k}} u_{,\overline{1}} - u_{,\overline{k}}\rho_{,\overline{1}} \\ &\sim \varepsilon(r^{\beta-1} + r^{-1}(\log r)^{-1}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.50}$$

And $|A_{\overline{jk}}|$ is bounded by ε for any $1 < j < k$. Therefore,

$$|\bar{\partial}\rho_\varepsilon \wedge \bar{\partial}u_2|^2_{\omega_g} e^{-\Phi} \sim \frac{\varepsilon^2}{r^2(\log r)^2},$$

whose L^1 norm converges to zero when ε does.

□

Equipped with these estimates, it's ready to prove our main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 3.11. First recall that by definition $v_\varepsilon = \chi_\varepsilon v_2$, and note that

$$\bar{\partial}v_\varepsilon \wedge \omega_g = \bar{\partial}(\chi_\varepsilon v_2 \wedge \omega_g) = -\bar{\partial}\rho_\varepsilon \wedge \bar{\partial}u_2, \tag{3.51}$$

which supports on an annuals region near the divisor. Then the Bochner formula, Proposition 3.17 says

$$\int_X |\bar{\partial}v_\varepsilon|^2_{\omega_g} e^{-\Phi} = \int_X |\partial^\Phi v_\varepsilon|^2 e^{-\Phi} - \int_X \omega_g \wedge v_\varepsilon \wedge \overline{v}_\varepsilon e^{-\Phi} + \int_X |\bar{\partial}v_\varepsilon \wedge \omega_g|^2_{\omega_g} e^{-\Phi}, \tag{3.52}$$

by taking $\alpha = \omega_g \wedge v_\varepsilon$. Notice that the first term $||\partial^\Phi v_\varepsilon||_{L^2(\Phi)}$ on the RHS of equation (3.52) converges to $||u_2||_{L^2(\Phi)}$ by Lemma 3.18, and the last term can be estimated since

$$||\bar{\partial}v_\varepsilon \wedge \omega_g||_{L^2(\omega_g,\Phi)} = ||\bar{\partial}\rho_\varepsilon \wedge \bar{\partial}u_2||_{L^2(\omega_g,\Phi)} \to 0, \tag{3.53}$$

by Lemma 3.19. Finally we take the limit on both sides

$$0 \leq \lim_\varepsilon \int_X |\bar{\partial}v_\varepsilon|^2_{\omega_g} e^{-\Phi} = \int_X |u_2|^2 e^{-\Phi} - \int_X |\bar{\partial}u_2|^2_{\omega_g} e^{-\Phi} \leq 0, \tag{3.54}$$

since by Donaldson [16], every eigenvalue $\lambda \geq 1$ for functions in the space $C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$. Therefore,

$$\lim_\varepsilon \int_X |\bar{\partial}v_\varepsilon|^2_{\omega_g} e^{-\Phi} = 0$$

and v_2 is a holomorphic vector field. □

3.4. **Some identities on Kähler-Einstein cone manifolds.**

Lemma 3.20. *For any real valued functions $\varphi, \psi, \zeta \in C^{2,\alpha}_\beta \cap C^\infty(M)$, assume $\varphi, \psi \in H_\theta$, we have*

$$\Delta_\theta \langle \partial\zeta, \partial\varphi\rangle_\theta = \langle \partial\bar{\partial}\zeta, \partial\bar{\partial}\varphi\rangle_\theta + \langle \partial(\Delta_\theta\zeta), \partial\varphi\rangle_\theta, \tag{3.55}$$

on M. In particular, we have

$$(\Delta_\theta + 1)\langle \partial\psi, \partial\varphi\rangle_\theta = \langle \partial\bar{\partial}\psi, \partial\bar{\partial}\varphi\rangle_\theta = (\Delta_\theta + 1)\langle \partial\varphi, \partial\psi\rangle_\theta,$$

on M. And the following integral is finite:

$$-\int_M \varphi \langle \partial\bar{\partial}\zeta, \partial\bar{\partial}\psi\rangle_\theta \theta^n = \int_M (\varphi\psi - \langle \partial\varphi, \partial\psi\rangle_\theta)\xi\theta^n, \tag{3.56}$$

where $\xi := (\Delta_\theta + 1)\zeta$.

Proof. The first equality is a point-wise computation, so we don't repeat it here. For the integral equality (3.56), notice that the RHS is always finite, since $\varphi\psi$, $\langle\partial\varphi, \partial\psi\rangle_\theta$ and ξ are all bounded function on X thanks to the $C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$ condition. Then according to Lemma (2.3) in Bando-Mabuchi [1], it is enough to prove the following integral equations hold, and the integrals are finite:

$$-\int_M \xi\partial(\varphi\bar\partial\psi)\wedge n\theta^{n-1} = \int_M \varphi\partial\xi\wedge\bar\partial\psi\wedge n\theta^{n-1}, \tag{3.57}$$

and

$$\int_M \varphi\Delta_\theta\langle\partial\zeta,\partial\psi\rangle_\theta\theta^n = -\int_M \varphi\langle\partial\zeta,\partial\psi\rangle_\theta\theta^n. \tag{3.58}$$

Here we invoke our cut off function χ_ε again, and notice that the LHS of equation (3.57) is finite. Then we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\int_M(\chi_\varepsilon\xi)\partial(\varphi\bar\partial\psi)\wedge n\theta^{n-1} = \int_M \xi\partial(\varphi\bar\partial\psi)\wedge n\theta^{n-1}.$$

But here we can apply integration by parts before taking the limit as

$$\begin{aligned} -\int_M(\chi_\varepsilon\xi)\partial(\varphi\bar\partial\psi)\wedge n\theta^{n-1} &= \int_M \partial(\chi_\varepsilon\xi)\wedge(\varphi\bar\partial\psi)\wedge n\theta^{n-1} \\ &= \int_M \chi_\varepsilon\partial\xi\wedge(\varphi\bar\partial\psi)\wedge n\theta^{n-1} \\ &+ \int_M \varphi\xi\mathrm{tr}_\theta(\partial\chi_\varepsilon\wedge\bar\partial\psi)\theta^n. \end{aligned} \tag{3.59}$$

This is because we can view the integral is taken on the open subset $D_{\varepsilon/3}$, and then one term in the integrant $(\chi_\varepsilon\xi)$ vanishes identically near $\partial D_{\varepsilon/3}$. Now we can estimate the second term on the last line of above equation as

$$\int_M \varphi\xi\mathrm{tr}_\theta(\partial\chi_\varepsilon\wedge\bar\partial\psi)\theta^n = \int_{D_\varepsilon - D_{\varepsilon/2}} \varphi\xi\mathrm{tr}_\theta(\partial\chi_\varepsilon\wedge\bar\partial\psi)\theta^n \to 0,$$

since

$$\mathrm{tr}_\theta(\partial\chi_\varepsilon\wedge\bar\partial\psi)\theta^n \sim \varepsilon(r^{2-\beta}\log r)^{-1} \text{ is } L^1$$

near the divisor (here we can use the local model metric ω_D instead of θ to compare thanks to the isometric property). Then we proved equation (3.57) by passing to limit.

For equation (3.58), the RHS is obviously finite, and we use the cut off function to approximate as

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M \chi_\varepsilon\varphi\Delta_\theta\langle\partial\zeta,\partial\psi\rangle_\theta\theta^n &= \int_M \Delta_\theta(\chi_\varepsilon\varphi)\langle\partial\zeta,\partial\psi\rangle_\theta\theta^n \\ &= \int_M \mathrm{tr}_\theta(\varphi\partial\bar\partial\chi_\varepsilon + \chi_\varepsilon\partial\bar\partial\varphi)\langle\partial\zeta,\partial\psi\rangle_\theta\theta^n \\ &+ \int_M \mathrm{tr}_\theta(\partial\varphi\wedge\bar\partial\chi_\varepsilon + \partial\chi_\varepsilon\wedge\bar\partial\varphi)\langle\partial\zeta,\partial\psi\rangle_\theta\theta^n. \end{aligned} \tag{3.60}$$

Then we can estimate as before:

$$\int_M \mathrm{tr}_\theta(\varphi\partial\bar\partial\chi_\varepsilon)\langle\partial\zeta,\partial\psi\rangle_\theta\theta^n = \int_{D_\varepsilon - D_{\varepsilon/2}} \mathrm{tr}_\theta(\varphi\partial\bar\partial\chi_\varepsilon)\langle\partial\zeta,\partial\psi\rangle_\theta\theta^n \to 0,$$

since $\langle\partial\zeta,\partial\psi\rangle_\theta$ is bounded, and

$$\mathrm{tr}_\theta(\varphi\partial\bar\partial\chi_\varepsilon)\theta^n \sim \varepsilon(r^2\log r^2)^{-1} \text{ is } L^1$$

near the divisor. And then

$$\int_M \mathrm{tr}_\theta(\partial\varphi\wedge\bar\partial\chi_\varepsilon)\langle\partial\zeta,\partial\psi\rangle_\theta\theta^n \to 0,$$

by the same reason. Therefore, the integral equality (3.58) follows by passing to the limit.

□

4. The continuity path

Let ω_φ be a Kähler-Einstein cone metrics which satisfy (2.10). Additionally, in order to normalise the Kähler cone potential φ, we require it lies in $\mathcal{H}^0_\beta$.

We connect it with ω by the continuity pate $\varphi(t)$ satisfying the equation of currents

$$Ric(\omega_{\varphi(t)}) = t\omega_{\varphi(t)} + (1-t)\omega + 2\pi(1-\beta)[D]. \tag{4.1}$$

It is obvious that $\varphi(t) = 0$ is a trivial solution for any $0 \le t \le 1$ and it is the unique solution for any $0 \le t < 1$, according to Proposition 4.1.

The trouble is at $t = 1$, where the linearised operator is

$$L_{\varphi(1)}u = \triangle_\varphi u + u$$

which is no longer invertible and whose coefficient is a Kähler cone metric. The kernel of $L_{\varphi(1)}$ is one to one corresponding to the holomorphic vector field, see Section 3. This difficulty is overcomed in Subsection 4.6 by extending Bando-Mabuchi's method to find a holomorphic transformation ρ such that

$$\rho^*\omega_\varphi = \theta = \omega_{\lambda_\theta}$$

and the linearised operator is invertible at such new Kähler-Einstein cone metric θ.

Recall the definition of $\mathfrak{f}$ as

$$\mathfrak{f} = -\log(\frac{\omega^n}{\omega_0^n}|s|_h^{2(1-\beta)}) - \delta|s|_h^{2\beta} + h_0. \tag{4.2}$$

Written in the potential level, the continuity path becomes

$$\frac{\omega_\varphi^n}{\omega^n} = e^{\mathfrak{f}-t\varphi} \tag{4.3}$$

under the normalization condition for $0 < t \leq 1$,

$$\int_M e^{\mathfrak{f}-t\varphi}\omega^n = \int_M \omega^n = V. \tag{4.4}$$

Using the smooth background metric ω, we also have

$$\frac{\omega_\varphi^n}{\omega_0^n} = |s|_h^{2(\beta-1)} e^{-t\varphi-\delta|s|_h^{2\beta}+h_0}. \tag{4.5}$$

4.1. **Eigenvalues and openness on $[0,1)$.**

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose* (4.3) *has a solution $\varphi(s)$ at $t = s$ for some $0 \leq s < 1$. Then there exists a small constant $\epsilon > 0$ such that* (4.3) *has a unique solution on $s \leq t \leq s + \epsilon$.*

Proof. We denote

$$F(\varphi, t) = \log \frac{\omega_\varphi^n}{\omega^n} - \mathfrak{f} + t\varphi. \tag{4.6}$$

It is a nonlinear operator from $C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$ to C^α_β. So the linearisd operator is

$$L_{\varphi(t)}u = \triangle_\varphi u + tu$$

also from $C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$ to C^α_β. The condition (4.13) gives the condition for $0 < t < 1$,

$$\int_M (\varphi + tu)\omega_\varphi^n = 0. \tag{4.7}$$

Solving the linear equation defined by the linearised operator requires the weak solution theory and Donaldson's regularity estimate of the linear equation with cone metric as the coefficients of the leading term, the details and more information could be found in Calamai-Zheng [8]. While, the following Lemma 4.2 tells that the linearisation equation has no kernel. □

Along the continuity path, the volume form $\omega^n_{\varphi(t)}$ can be viewed as a metric on $-K_X$, i.e. letting

$$\psi(t) := -\log \omega^n_{\varphi(t)},$$

Then the Laplacian operator for the metric $\omega_{\varphi(t)}$ can be written as

$$\Delta_{\omega_{\varphi(t)}} = \bar\partial^*_{\psi(t)}\bar\partial,$$

and it can be viewed as an operator acting on $(n,0)$ forms with value in $-K_X$.

According to Lemma 3.16, the Bochner formula reads as

$$\int_X |\bar\partial\gamma_\alpha|^2_{\omega_{\varphi(t)}} = \int_X |\bar\partial\alpha|^2_{\omega_{\varphi(t)}} + \int_X |\bar\partial^*_{\psi(t)}\alpha|^2_{\omega_{\varphi(t)}} - \int_X Ric(\alpha,\alpha), \tag{4.8}$$

where α is any $(n,1)$ form with value in $-K_X$ vanishing on D_ε.

Now suppose $u(t)$ is an eigenfunction of $\Delta_{\omega_{\varphi(t)}}$ with eigenvalue λ, and then we can assume $u(t)$ is real-valued and belongs to the Hölder

space $C^{2,\alpha}_{\beta}$. That is, there exists an $(n-1,0)$ form $v(t)$ with value in $-K_X$ satisfying

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcl} \omega_{\varphi(t)} \wedge v(t) & = & \bar{\partial} u(t), \\ \partial^{\psi(t)} v(t) & = & \lambda u(t). \end{array} \right. \tag{4.9}$$

Then we are going to prove the following lemma.

Proposition 4.2. *For all $\lambda \leq t$, there is no such eigenfunction $u(t)$ for λ.*

Proof. Suppose $u(t)$ exists for some $\lambda \leq t$, and $v(t)$ is defined as equation (4.9). Define

$$v_{t,\varepsilon} := \chi_\varepsilon \cdot v(t)$$

and choose $\alpha = \bar{\partial} u(t)$ in the Bochner formula (4.8), we have the following identity

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X |\bar{\partial} v_{t,\varepsilon}|^2_{\omega_{\varphi(t)}} e^{-\psi(t)} &= \int_X |\partial^{\psi(t)} v_{t,\varepsilon}|^2_{\omega_{\varphi(t)}} e^{-\psi(t)} - \int_X Ric(\omega_{\varphi(t)}) \wedge v_{t,\varepsilon} \wedge \overline{v}_{t,\varepsilon} e^{-\psi(t)} \\ &+ \int_X |\bar{\partial} v_{t,\varepsilon} \wedge \omega_{\varphi(t)}|^2_{\omega_{\varphi(t)}} e^{-\psi(t)} \\ &< \int_X |\partial^{\psi(t)} v_{t,\varepsilon}|^2_{\omega_{\varphi(t)}} e^{-\psi(t)} - t \int_X \omega_{\varphi(t)} \wedge v_{t,\varepsilon} \wedge \overline{v}_{t,\varepsilon} e^{-\psi(t)} \\ &+ \int_X |\bar{\partial} v_{t,\varepsilon} \wedge \omega_{\varphi(t)}|^2_{\omega_{\varphi(t)}} e^{-\psi(t)}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

Thanks to Lemma 3.18 and 3.19, we can take the limit when $\varepsilon \to 0$ as

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< \lambda^2 \int_M |u(t)|^2_{\omega_{\varphi(t)}} e^{-\psi(t)} - t \int_M |\bar{\partial} u(t)|^2_{\omega_{\varphi(t)}} e^{-\psi(t)} \\ &= \lambda(\lambda - t) \int_X |u(t)|^2_{\omega_{\varphi(t)}} e^{-\psi(t)} \leq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

The last line we used the integration by parts since $u(t), \varphi(t) \in C^{2,\alpha}_{\beta}$, and the contradiction follows. □

Lemma 4.3. *The $I - J$ is non-decreasing along the continuity path.*

Proof. The latter follows from the following computation and Proposition 4.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}(I-J) &= -\frac{1}{V} \int_M \varphi \triangle_\varphi \dot{\varphi} \omega^n_\varphi \\ &= \frac{1}{V} \int_M (\triangle_\varphi \dot{\varphi})^2 - t |\partial \dot{\varphi}|^2 \omega^n_\varphi. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\frac{d}{dt}(I-J) \geq 0$$

follows from Lemma 4.2. □

4.2. **Approximation of the continuity path.** We now prove the approximation of the continuity path.

Recall the potential equation along the continuity path,

$$\frac{\omega_\varphi^n}{\omega_0^n} = |s|_h^{2(\beta-1)} e^{-t\varphi - \delta|s|_h^{2\beta} + h_0} \tag{4.12}$$

under the normalisation condition for $0 < t \leq 1$,

$$\int_M |s|_h^{2(\beta-1)} e^{-t\varphi - \delta|s|_h^{2\beta} + h_0} \omega_0^n = V. \tag{4.13}$$

From now on, we fix τ to be a small strictly positive constant which is less than 1.

Theorem 4.4. *Along the continuity path $\{\omega_{\varphi(t)}; \tau \leq t \leq 1\}$, the following holds. The path $\omega_{\varphi(t)}$ is the Gromov-Hausdorff limit of a sequence of smooth Kähler metrics $\omega^i_{\varphi(t)}$ with uniformly bounded diameter and non-negative Ricci curvature.*

Proof. This is an adaption of Theorem 1.1 in [11] to our continuity path ω_φ. We omit the index t of $\varphi(t)$ in the following proof, since it is obvious.

Step 1. Since ω_φ is in L^p, we choose a sequence of smooth volume form η_ϵ, which L^p converges to ω_φ. Then Yau's resolution of Calabi conjecture provides a Kähler potential φ_ϵ, such that

$$\omega_{\varphi_\epsilon}^n = \eta_\epsilon. \tag{4.14}$$

From [24], φ_ϵ has uniform C^α bound and thus converges to φ in $C^{\alpha'}$ for any $\alpha' < \alpha$ as $\epsilon \to 0$.

Step 2. Adjusting by a constant such that

$$\int_M (|s|_h^2 + \epsilon)^{\beta-1} e^{-t\varphi_\epsilon - \delta|s|_h^{2\beta} + h_0} \omega_0^n = V, \tag{4.15}$$

then replace φ on the right hand side of (4.12) with φ_ϵ, we have

$$\frac{\omega_{\psi_\epsilon}^n}{\omega_0^n} = (|s|_h^2 + \epsilon)^{\beta-1} e^{-t\varphi_\epsilon - \delta|s|_h^{2\beta} + h_0}. \tag{4.16}$$

Again, Yau's celebrated work gives ψ_ϵ satisfies this equation. Again, from [24], ψ_ϵ has uniform C^α bound and converges to ψ_0 in $C^{\alpha'}$ for any $\alpha' < \alpha$ as $\epsilon \to 0$.

Step 3. We compute the Ricci curvature of ω_{ψ_ϵ}. With the formula

$$i\partial\bar\partial \log(f + \epsilon) \geq \frac{f}{f+\epsilon} i\partial\bar\partial \log f, \tag{4.17}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
Ric(\omega_{\psi_\epsilon}) &= Ric(\omega_0) - i\partial\bar\partial h_0 + (1-\beta)i\partial\bar\partial\log(|s|_h^2+\epsilon) + ti\partial\bar\partial\varphi_\epsilon + \delta i\partial\bar\partial|s|_h^{2\beta} \\
&= \omega_0 - (1-\beta)i\partial\bar\partial\log h + (1-\beta)i\partial\bar\partial\log(|s|_h^2+\epsilon) + ti\partial\bar\partial\varphi_\epsilon + \delta i\partial\bar\partial|s|_h^{2\beta} \\
&= t\omega_{\varphi_\epsilon} + (1-t)\omega - (1-\beta)i\partial\bar\partial\log h + (1-\beta)i\partial\bar\partial\log(|s|_h^2+\epsilon) \\
&\geq t\omega_{\varphi_\epsilon} + (1-t)\omega - (1-\beta)i\partial\bar\partial\log h + (1-\beta)\frac{|s|_h^2}{|s|_h^2+\epsilon}i\partial\bar\partial\log|s|_h^2 \\
&\geq t\omega_{\varphi_\epsilon} + (1-t)\omega + (1-\beta)[-i\partial\bar\partial\log h + \frac{|s|_h^2}{|s|_h^2+\epsilon}i\partial\bar\partial\log|s|_h^2].
\end{aligned}$$

By our choice of h which is the Hermitian metric on $[D]$, we have

$$-i\partial\bar\partial\log h + \frac{|s|_h^2}{|s|_h^2+\epsilon}i\partial\bar\partial\log|s|_h^2 \geq 0. \tag{4.18}$$

Thus we have for any $\epsilon \in (0,1]$,

$$Ric(\omega_{\psi_\epsilon}) \geq t\omega_{\varphi_\epsilon} \geq 0.$$

To sum up, we have proved

Proposition 4.5. *The approximation sequence ω_{ψ_ϵ} has non-negative Ricci curvature.*

Step 4. We prove the rough second order estimate of ψ_ϵ. From the Chern-Lu inequality (see Section 4.3.2)

$$\triangle_{\psi_\epsilon}(\log\operatorname{tr}_{\omega_{\psi_\epsilon}}\omega_0 - C\psi_\epsilon) \geq \frac{R^{i\bar j}_{\psi_\epsilon}g_{0i\bar j} - g^{i\bar j}_{\psi_\epsilon}g^{k\bar l}_{\psi_\epsilon}Rm(\omega_0)_{i\bar jk\bar l}}{\operatorname{tr}_{\omega_{\psi_\epsilon}}\omega_0} - Cn + C\operatorname{tr}_{\omega_{\psi_\epsilon}}\omega_0.$$

Since when $0 \leq t \leq \beta$, $Ric_{\psi_\epsilon} \geq 0$ we have

$$\triangle_{\psi_\epsilon}(\log\operatorname{tr}_{\omega_{\psi_\epsilon}}\omega_0 - C\psi_\epsilon) \geq [-\max Rm(\omega_0) + C]\cdot\operatorname{tr}_{\omega_{\psi_\epsilon}}\omega_0 - Cn.$$

Choosing $C = \max Rm(\omega_0) + 1$, we have the lower bound of ω_{ψ_ϵ}

$$tr_{\omega_{\psi_\epsilon}}\omega_0 \leq C(\operatorname{osc}\psi_\epsilon).$$

While, we also have the upper bound

$$\operatorname{tr}_{\omega_0}\omega_{\psi_\epsilon} \leq [\frac{\omega^n_{\psi_\epsilon}}{\omega_0^n}\cdot tr_{\omega_{\psi_\epsilon}}\omega_0]^n = [(|s|_h^2+\epsilon)^{\beta-1}e^{-t\varphi_\epsilon+h_0}tr_{\omega_{\psi_\epsilon}}\omega]^n.$$

Thus there is a constant C (independent of t) such that for any $\epsilon \in (0,1]$,

$$C^{-1}\omega_0 \leq \omega_{\psi_\epsilon} \leq \frac{C}{(|s|_h^2+\epsilon)^{1-\beta}}\omega_0. \tag{4.19}$$

Thus we have the uniform diameter bound of ω_{ψ_ϵ} by measuring the length in a small neighbourhood of D under ω_0 and outside under ω_{ψ_ϵ}. The length outside is bounded by using the inequality above. in conclusion, we have

Proposition 4.6. *For any $0 \leq t \leq 1$, the approximation sequences ω_{ψ_ϵ} have uniformly bounded diameter.*

Step 5. We show that the limits from **Step 2.** have the relation,

$$\psi_0 = \varphi + constant.$$

In order to prove this identity, we apply the formula

$$\int_X (\varphi_\epsilon - \psi_\epsilon)(\omega_{\psi_\epsilon}^n - \omega_{\varphi_\epsilon}^n) = \int_X i\partial(\varphi_\epsilon - \psi_\epsilon) \wedge \bar{\partial}(\varphi_\epsilon - \psi_\epsilon) \wedge \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \omega_{\psi_\epsilon}^k \wedge \omega_{\varphi_\epsilon}^{n-1-k}.$$

Cutting out a small neighbourhood D_δ for arbitrary $\delta > 0$, we have RHS

$$\geq \int_{X \setminus D_\delta} i\partial(\varphi_\epsilon - \psi_\epsilon) \wedge \bar{\partial}(\varphi_\epsilon - \psi_\epsilon) \wedge \omega_{\psi_\epsilon}^{n-1}.$$

From **Step 4**, we further have

$$\geq C \int_{X \setminus D_\delta} i\partial(\varphi_\epsilon - \psi_\epsilon) \wedge \bar{\partial}(\varphi_\epsilon - \psi_\epsilon) \wedge \omega_0^{n-1}.$$

While, LHS converges to 0 as $\epsilon \to 0$. Thus δ is arbitrary, we have $\psi_0 = \varphi$ up to a constant on M.

Step 6. Proposition 2.5 in [11] tells us ω_{ψ_ϵ} Gromov-Hausdorff converges to ω_φ as $\epsilon \to 0$. Cheeger-Colding [9] implies there is a minimising geodesic in M such that its length is close to the diameter of X. Then when $t \geq \tau$, ω_φ has diameter bound $\pi\sqrt{\frac{m-1}{\tau}}$ due to Myers' theorem. Thus we could choose small ϵ such that the sequence has diameters bounded by $2\pi\sqrt{\frac{m-1}{\tau}}$. □

The next Sobolev inequality along the continuity path will be used in this paper.

Theorem 4.7. *Let ω_φ lies in the continuity path $\{\omega_{\varphi(t)}; \tau < t \leq 1\}$. For any $1 \leq q < m$, there exists a uniform constant $A = A(n, q, V, \tau)$ such that for any $w \in W^{1,q}(M)$,*

$$\|w\|_{p;\omega_{\varphi(t)}} \leq A\|\nabla w\|_{q;\omega_{\varphi(t)}} + Vol(M, \omega_{\varphi(t)})^{\frac{-1}{m}} \|w\|_{q;\omega_{\varphi(t)}},$$

where the constant p is defined by $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{m} = \frac{1}{q}$.

Proof. We cite the Sobolev inequality by Croke [15], Gallot [17, 18] and Ilias [22]. Let (M, g) be a m-dimensional compact Riemannian manifold with Ricci curvature, volume and diameter satisfying

$$Ric \geq (m-1)kg, \quad Vol(g) \geq V \text{ and } diam(M, g) \leq d. \tag{4.20}$$

In which, k, $V > 0$, $d > 0$ are real numbers. For any $1 \leq q < m$, there exists constant $A = A(n, q, k, V, d)$ such that for any $w \in W^{1,q}(M, g)$,

$$\|w\|_{p;g} \leq A\|\nabla w\|_{q;g} + Vol(M, g)^{\frac{-1}{m}} \|w\|_{q;g},$$

where the constant p is defined by $\frac{1}{p}+\frac{1}{m}=\frac{1}{q}$.

When $\tau<t\leq 1$, given $w\in W^{1,q}(M,\omega_\varphi)$, we see that w also stays in $W^{1,q}(M,\omega^i_\varphi)$. Then we apply this inequality to the approximation sequence ω^i_φ which have uniformly non-negative Ricci curvature and uniform diameter bounded by $d=2\pi\sqrt{\frac{m-1}{\tau}}$. Actually, on the regular part M, our sequence smoothly converges to φ from the construction, so the conclusion follows from Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem and the fact that D is a measure zero set. □

4.3. **Apriori estimates.**

4.3.1. *Zero order estimate.* We prove the zero order estimate by the adaption of the De Giorgi iteration, which is an improvement of Proposition 2.8 in [25] by Li and the second author.

Proposition 4.8. *Assume that we have the following Sobolev inequality with respect to ω, for any $w\in W^{1,2}(\omega)$,*

$$\|w\|^2_{2^*}\leq C_S(\omega)(\|\nabla w\|^2_2+\|w\|^2_2).$$

We say v is a $W^{1,2}$ sub-solution of the linear equation in the weak sense, i.e. for any $\eta\in C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$,

$$\int_M(\partial v,\partial\eta)_\omega\omega^n\leq-\int_M f\eta\omega^n. \tag{4.21}$$

Moreover, we assume that $f\in L^{\frac{p}{2}}$ with $p>2n$ and let

$$\tilde{v}=v-\frac{1}{V}\int_M v\,\omega^n,$$

then there exits a constant C depending on the Sobolev constant C_S with respect to ω such that

$$\sup_M\tilde{v}\leq C(\|f\|_{p^*}+\|\tilde{v}\|_1). \tag{4.22}$$

In which, $p^*=\frac{2np}{2n+p}$ and all the L^p-norms, including in the following proof, are regarding to the mearsure $\frac{\omega^n}{V}$.

Proof. We denote by $u=(\tilde{v}-k)_+$ the positive part of $\tilde{v}-k$ for any constant k and set

$$A(k)=\{x\in M|\tilde{v}(x)>k\}$$

where u is positive.

We first substitute η in (4.38) with u on both sides and use integration by parts

$$\int_M|\nabla u|^2\omega^n\leq-\int_M uf\omega^n. \tag{4.23}$$

Then applying the Hölder's inequality to the right hand side, we get its upper bound

$$\|u\|_{2^*} \cdot \|f\|_{p^*} \cdot |A(k)|^r. \tag{4.24}$$

In which,

$$m = 2n, \quad 2^* = \frac{2m}{m-2}, \quad p^* = \frac{mp}{m+p}, \quad r = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}.$$

We next use the Sobolev inequality with respect to ω,

$$\|u\|_{2^*}^2 \leq C_S(\omega)(\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \|u\|_2^2).$$

Here the norms are measured with respect to the metric ω. Observing that by the Hölder inequality

$$\|u\|_2 \leq \|u\|_{2^*} \cdot |A(k)|^{\frac{1}{m}}$$

and bounding the first term in the right hand side of the Sobolev inequality by the estimate (4.24) following from the equation, we obtain

$$\|u\|_{2^*}^2 \leq C_S(\omega)(\|u\|_{2^*} \cdot \|f\|_{p^*} \cdot |A(k)|^r + \|u\|_{2^*}^2 \cdot |A(k)|^{\frac{2}{m}}). \tag{4.25}$$

We then show that how to choose a k_0 such that for any $k \geq k_0$,

$$|A(k)|^{\frac{2}{m}} \leq \frac{1}{2C_S(\omega)}. \tag{4.26}$$

In order to choose k_0, we separate two cases. On case is

$$\|\tilde{v}\|_2^2 \leq \|\nabla \tilde{v}\|_2^2. \tag{4.27}$$

The right hand side of (4.27) is bounded from the inequality (4.23) via applying the Hölder inequality to its right hand side,

$$\|\nabla \tilde{v}\|_2^2 \leq \|\tilde{v}\|_2 \|f\|_2.$$

Thus we have

$$\|\tilde{v}\|_2 \leq \|f\|_2 \leq V^{\frac{2mp}{mp-2m-2p}} \cdot \|f\|_{p^*}.$$

The other case is

$$\|\tilde{v}\|_2^2 \geq \|\nabla \tilde{v}\|_2^2.$$

The Sobolev inequality immediately implies that

$$\|\tilde{v}\|_{2^*}^2 \leq 2C_S(\omega)\|\tilde{v}\|_2^2.$$

We then apply the interpolation inequality the right hand side of the inequality above,

$$\|\tilde{v}\|_{2^*}^2 \leq 2C_S(\omega)\|\tilde{v}\|_1^{\frac{2}{n+1}} \|\tilde{v}\|_{2^*}^{\frac{2n}{n+1}}.$$

Thus

$$\|\tilde{v}\|_2 \leq V^{\frac{1}{n}} \|\tilde{v}\|_{2^*} \leq 2C_S(\omega)\|\tilde{v}\|_1.$$

Combining two cases, we see that

$$\|\tilde{v}\|_2 \leq C_5(\|f\|_{p^*} + \|\tilde{v}\|_1).$$

In which, $C_5 = C_S(\omega) + V^{\frac{2mp}{mp-2m-2p}}$. From the definition,

$$k_0^2|A(k_0)| \leq \|\tilde{v}\|_2^2.$$

Thus we choose

$$k_0^2 = C_5^2(\|f\|_{p^*} + \|\tilde{v}\|_1)^2(2C_S(\omega))^{\frac{m}{2}}$$

so that

$$|A(k_0)|^{\frac{2}{m}} \leq \frac{1}{2C_S(\omega)}$$

and (4.26) is proved.

For any $k \geq k_0$, we absorb the second term of right hand side of (4.25) by the left hand side, when applying (4.26), thus we obtain,

$$\|u\|_{2^*} \leq 2C_S(\omega) \cdot \|f\|_{p^*} \cdot |A(k)|^r.$$

The inverse inequality follows from the definition of $A(h)$ and u, when $h > k \geq k_0$,

$$\|u\|_{2^*} \geq (h-k) \cdot |A(h)|^{\frac{1}{2^*}}.$$

At last, combining these two equalities to obtain the iteration inequality

$$(h-k) \cdot |A(h)|^{\frac{1}{2^*}} \leq 2C_S(\omega) \cdot \|f\|_{p^*} \cdot |A(k)|^r.$$

and then applying the iteration lemma (see [19]), we have

$$A(k_0 + d) = 0$$

for a constant $d = 2C_S(\omega)\|f\|_{p^*}$. In the other word,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{v} &\leq k_0 + d \\ &\leq C_5(\|f\|_{p^*} + \|\tilde{v}\|_1)(2C_S(\omega))^{\frac{m}{4}} + 2C_S(\omega)\|f\|_{p^*}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the proposition is proved. □

We then apply the Proposition above to the following equation

$$n + \triangle_\omega \varphi \geq 0. \tag{4.28}$$

Corollary 4.9. *(Upper estimate) There exists a constant C depending on V, n, the Sobolev and Poincaré constant of the fixed background metric ω such that*

$$\sup_M \varphi - \frac{1}{V}\int_M \varphi\omega^n \leq C.$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{\varphi} = \varphi - \frac{1}{V}\int_M \varphi\omega^n$. The (4.28) is well-defined on the regular part M, we need to transform it into the integration form. Since $\varphi \in C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$, the integration by parts, Lemma 2.1 in Calamai-Zheng [8] provides that (4.30) could be transformed to, for any $\eta \in C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$,

$$\int_M (\partial\tilde{\varphi}, \partial\eta)_\omega \omega^n \leq n\int_M \eta\omega^n. \tag{4.29}$$

Now since the background metric is ω which is fixed, we have the bound of the Sobolev constant and the Poincaré constant of ω. Thus the assumptions in Proposition 4.8 are fulfilled and we have

$$\sup_M \varphi - \frac{1}{V}\int_M \varphi\,\omega^n \leq C(n + \|\tilde{\varphi}\|_{1;\omega}).$$

We would prove that $\|\tilde{\varphi}\|_{1;\omega}$ is bounded. Replacing η with $\tilde{\varphi}$ in (4.29), we have

$$||\partial\tilde{\varphi}||^2_{2;\omega} \leq n||\tilde{\varphi}||_{1;\omega}.$$

The Poincaré inequality implies that there is a constant C_P such that

$$||\tilde{\varphi}||^2_{2;\omega} \leq C_P||\partial\tilde{\varphi}||^2_{2;\omega}.$$

While, the Hölder inequality gives that

$$||\tilde{\varphi}||_{1;\omega} \leq V^{\frac{1}{2}}||\tilde{\varphi}||_{2;\omega}.$$

Combining all these three inequalities together, we have $||\tilde{\varphi}||_{2;\omega}$ is bounded, then from the the last inequality, so is $||\tilde{\varphi}||_{1;\omega}$. Therefore, we have proved (4.9). □

We then apply Proposition 4.8 to the following equation

$$n - \triangle_\varphi\varphi > 0. \tag{4.30}$$

Corollary 4.10. *(Rough lower estimate) Assume that $\varphi \in C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$. There exists a constant C depending on $C_S(\omega_\varphi), V, n$ such that*

$$\inf_M \varphi - \int_M \varphi\,\omega^n_\varphi \geq -C(1 + \|\tilde{\varphi}\|_{1;\omega_\varphi}), \quad t \in [\tau, 1].$$

Proof. Since when $\varphi \in C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$, we apply integration by parts in Calamai-Zheng [8], to (4.30), then obtain for any $\eta \in C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$,

$$\int_M (\partial\varphi, \partial\eta)_{\omega_\varphi}\omega^n_\varphi > -n\int_M \eta\omega^n_\varphi.$$

For any $\tau \leq t \leq 1$, we have the Sobolev inequalities of ω_φ (Theorem 4.7) with uniform Sobolev constant. In this case, we use Proposition 4.8, replacing ω with ω_φ and obtain the lower bound of $\tilde{\varphi} = \varphi - \frac{1}{V}\int_M \varphi\omega^n_\varphi$. □

Proposition 4.11. *(Zero order estimate) We are given a small fixed positive number $0 < \tau < 1$ to be determined later. There exists a constant C depending on τ, V, n, the Sobolev and Poincaré constant of the fixed background metric ω, and the Sobolev constant of ω_φ i.e. $C_S(\omega_\varphi)$ such that*

$$\operatorname{osc}(\varphi) \leq C \cdot (I(\omega, \omega_\varphi) + 1), \quad t \in [0, 1]. \tag{4.31}$$

Remark 4.12. *We do not need the Poincaré constant of ω_φ here.*

Proof. There are two cases.

Case 1. Thanks to the linearised operator of the continuity path is invertible at $t = 0$, (Proposition 4.1), we could choose a sufficient small $0 \leq t \leq \tau$ to have a uniform zero order estimate of the solution φ on $[0, \tau]$.

Case 2. When $\tau \leq t \leq 1$, putting the upper estimate (Corollary 4.9) and the rough lower estimate (Corollary 4.10) together, we arrive at

$$\operatorname{osc}(\varphi) \leq I(\omega, \omega_\varphi) + C \cdot (1 + \|\tilde{\varphi}\|_{1;\omega_\varphi}).$$

In order to bound $\|\tilde{\varphi}\|_{1;\omega_\varphi}$, we calculate

$$\begin{aligned}\|\tilde{\varphi}\|_{1;\omega_\varphi} = \int_M |\tilde{\varphi}|\omega_\varphi^n &\leq \int_M |\sup_M \tilde{\varphi} - \tilde{\varphi}|\omega_\varphi^n + \int_M |\sup_M \tilde{\varphi}|\omega_\varphi^n \\ &= V \sup_M \tilde{\varphi} + \int_M \tilde{\varphi}\omega_\varphi^n + V \sup_M \tilde{\varphi} \\ &\leq 2V \sup_M \tilde{\varphi} = 2V(I(\omega, \omega_\varphi) + C).\end{aligned}$$

At the last step, we use (4.9), $\sup_M \varphi \leq \frac{1}{V}\int_M \varphi\omega^n + C$ again. In this case, for any $\tau \leq t \leq 1$ the Sobolev constants of ω_φ (Theorem 4.7) are uniform and depend on τ, V, n.

The bound of I follows from the equivalence of the I and J functional and the monotonicity of $I - J$ along the continuity path from the Lemma 4.3. Therefore, the lemma is proved. □

4.3.2. *Higher order estimates.* In order to derive the second order estimate, we follow the proof of Yau's Schwarz lemma by applying the Chern-Lu formula [31]. We derive the formula of

$$A := \operatorname{tr}_{\omega_\varphi}\omega - C\varphi = n - \Delta_\varphi\varphi - C\varphi.$$

We compute,

$$\Delta_\varphi(\operatorname{tr}_{\omega_\varphi}\omega) = R_\varphi{}^{i\bar{j}}g_{i\bar{j}} - g_\varphi{}^{i\bar{j}}g_\varphi{}^{k\bar{l}}R_{i\bar{j}k\bar{l}} - g^{i\bar{j}}g_\varphi{}^{k\bar{l}}g_\varphi{}^{p\bar{q}}\partial_{\bar{l}}g_{\varphi p\bar{j}}\partial_k g_{\varphi i\bar{q}}\,. \tag{4.32}$$

The Schwarz inequality implies

$$g_\varphi^{k\bar{l}}\partial_k g_\varphi^{i\bar{j}}g_{i\bar{j}}\partial_{\bar{l}}g_\varphi^{p\bar{q}}g_{p\bar{q}} \leq -(g_\varphi^{k\bar{l}}g_\varphi^{p\bar{j}}g_{i\bar{j}}\partial_{\bar{l}}g_{\varphi p\bar{q}}\partial_k g_\varphi^{i\bar{q}})(g_\varphi^{i\bar{j}}g_{i\bar{j}})\,. \tag{4.33}$$

We apply (4.32) and (4.33) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\triangle_\varphi[\log tr_{\omega_\varphi}\omega] &= \frac{\triangle_\varphi(tr_{\omega_\varphi}\omega)}{tr_{\omega_\varphi}\omega} - \frac{g_\varphi^{k\bar{l}}\partial_k g_\varphi^{i\bar{j}}g_{i\bar{j}}\partial_{\bar{l}}g_\varphi^{p\bar{q}}g_{p\bar{q}}}{(tr_{\omega_\varphi}\omega)^2} \\ &\geq \frac{R_\varphi^{i\bar{j}}g_{i\bar{j}} - g_\varphi^{i\bar{j}}g_\varphi^{k\bar{l}}R_{i\bar{j}k\bar{l}}}{tr_{\omega_\varphi}\omega}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\triangle_\varphi(\log \operatorname{tr}_{\omega_\varphi}\omega - C\varphi) \geq \frac{R_\varphi^{i\bar{j}}g_{i\bar{j}} - g_\varphi^{i\bar{j}}g_\varphi^{k\bar{l}}R_{i\bar{j}k\bar{l}}}{\operatorname{tr}_{\omega_\varphi}\omega} - Cn + C\operatorname{tr}_{\omega_\varphi}\omega.$$

Since along the path, we have $Ric_\varphi > 0$ and $Rm(\omega)$ has upper bound. Applying the cone maximum principle, we have the lower bound of ω_φ

$$tr_{\omega_\varphi}\omega \leq C(\operatorname{osc}\varphi, \sup R_{i\bar{j}k\bar{l}}).$$

While, we also have its upper bound

$$\operatorname{tr}_\omega \omega_\varphi \leq [\frac{\omega_\varphi^n}{\omega^n} tr_{\omega_\varphi}\omega]^n = [e^{\mathfrak{f}-t\varphi} tr_{\omega_\varphi}\omega]^n.$$

The Evans-Krylov estimate was proved by Calamai and the second author in Proposition 4.6 and 4.7 in [8] with an angle restriction till $\frac{2}{3}$. Generally, we encourage readers for further reading like [12], [14], [23], [20] with the references therein.

4.4. **Existence of Kähler-Einstein cone metrics.** A byproduct of Section 4.3 is a proof of the existence of the Kähler-Einstein cone metrics. Ding's functional could be generalised to the conic setting, i.e. for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_\beta$,

$$D_\omega(\varphi) = \frac{1}{V}\int_M \varphi\omega^n - J_\omega(\varphi),$$
$$F(\varphi) = -D_\omega(\varphi) - \frac{1}{V}\int_M f_\omega\omega^n + \log(\frac{1}{V}\int_M e^{-\varphi+f_\omega}\omega^n).$$

Theorem 4.13. *When the conic Ding functional is proper, i.e. there are two positive constants A and B such that for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_\beta$,*

$$F_\omega(\varphi) \geq AI_\omega(\varphi) - B.$$

Then there exits Kähler-Einstein cone metrics.

Proof. When we assume that the conic Ding functional is proper, the $I_\omega - J_\omega$ functional is bounded and then the uniform estimates hold in the sections above. □

The notion of the properness for the smooth Kähler metrics was introduced in Tian [29].

4.5. **Choosing the automorphism.** We are given a Kähler cone metric ω and an orbit $\mathcal{O}$ in the space of Kähler-Einstein cone metrics. Let θ be a Kähler-Einstein cone metric in the orbit $\mathcal{O}$. Then there exists $\lambda_\theta \in C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$ such that

$$\theta = \omega_{\lambda_\theta} = \omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\lambda_\theta.$$

We minimise the following functional over the orbit, i.e. for any $\theta \in \mathcal{O}$,

$$E(\theta;\omega) := I(\omega,\theta) - J(\omega,\theta)$$
$$= -\int_M \lambda_\theta\theta^n.$$

Proposition 4.14. *$E(\cdot;\omega)$ has a minimum θ over the orbit $\theta \in \mathcal{O}$ such that $\theta = \omega_{\lambda_\theta}$ and $\lambda_\theta \in C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$.*

Proof. In order to apply the variational direct method, it suffices to prove the level set of the $E \leq r$ is bounded. That follows from the apriori estimates including the zero order estimate (Proposition 4.11) and the higher order estimates (Section 4.3.2). The former is true since $I - J$ is bounded and over the whole orbit all metrics have the same Sobolev constant. While, the latter holds since we have Ricci lower bound of each Kähler-Einstein cone metric in $\theta \in \mathcal{O}$. □

From now on, we use θ to denote the minimiser. We also denote

$$L_\theta = \triangle_\theta + id.$$

Lemma 4.15. *Assume that $\theta = \omega_{\lambda_\theta}$ is a minimal point of the function E,*

- $\forall u \in Ker(L_\theta)$, $\int_M \lambda_\theta \cdot u \cdot \theta^n = 0$,
- $$\begin{aligned} D^2E_\theta(u,v) &= \int_M (1 + \frac{1}{2}\triangle_\theta \lambda_\theta) \cdot u \cdot v \cdot \theta^n \\ &= \int_M uv - [uv - < \partial u, \partial v >_\theta] \cdot \lambda_\theta \cdot \theta^n. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We let $\sigma(t)$ be the one-parameter subgroup generated by the real part of the holomorphic vector field defined by $\uparrow^\theta \bar{\partial} u$, which follows from Section 3.2. I.e.

$$\sigma(t) = exp(t \operatorname{Re} \uparrow^\theta \bar{\partial} u).$$

There exists $\rho(t) \in C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$ such that

$$\sigma^*(t)\theta = \theta + i\partial\bar{\partial}\rho(t)$$

or

$$\sigma^*(t)\theta = \omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}(\lambda_\theta + \rho(t)).$$

The potential $\rho(t)$ satisfies

$$\rho(t=0) = 0, \quad \frac{d}{dt}|_{t=0}\rho(t) = u$$

and the Kähler-Einstein cone equation

$$\omega^n_{\lambda_\theta + \rho(t)} = \theta^n e^{-\rho(t)}.$$

Differentiating on the both sides on t,

$$(\triangle_{\lambda_\theta + \rho(t)} + 1)\frac{d\rho(t)}{dt} = 0. \tag{4.34}$$

and taking $t = 0$, we have

$$(\triangle_\theta + 1)u = 0.$$

So integrating over M with respect to θ we arrive at

$$\int_M u\theta^n = 0. \tag{4.35}$$

Now the E-functional of $\sigma^*(t)\theta$ becomes

$$E(\sigma^*(t)\theta;\omega) = -\int_M \lambda_\theta + \rho(t)\omega^n_{\lambda_\theta+\rho(t)}.$$

Differentiating the both sides on t

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}E(\sigma^*(t)\theta;\omega)\\ &= -\int_M \frac{d}{dt}\rho(t)\omega^n_{\lambda_\theta+\rho(t)} - \int_M (\lambda_\theta+\rho(t))\triangle_{\lambda_\theta+\rho(t)}\frac{d}{dt}\rho(t)\omega^n_{\lambda_\theta+\rho(t)},\end{aligned}$$

using (4.34)

$$= -\int_M \frac{d}{dt}\rho(t)\omega^n_{\lambda_\theta+\rho(t)} + \int_M (\lambda_\theta+\rho(t))\frac{d}{dt}\rho(t)\omega^n_{\lambda_\theta+\rho(t)}, \tag{4.36}$$

evaluating at $t=0$

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}E(\sigma^*(t)\theta;\omega)|_{t=0}\\ &= -\int_M u\theta^n + \int_M \lambda_\theta u\theta^n,\end{aligned}$$

applying the identity (4.35) above, we obtain the RHS equals

$$-\int_M \lambda_\theta u\theta^n.$$

Thus the the first identity follows from $u \in Ker(L_\theta)$, i.e. $\triangle_\theta u = -u$.

We further denote $\sigma(s)$ the one-parameter subgroup generated by the holomorphic potential v, i.e. $\sigma(s) = exp(\mathrm{Re}\uparrow^\theta \bar\partial v)$. Let $\sigma(s,t) = \sigma(s)\sigma(t)$, then there exists Kähler cone potential $\rho(s,t)$ such that

$$\sigma^*(s,t)\theta = \theta + i\partial\bar\partial\rho(s,t)$$

or

$$\sigma^*(s,t)\theta = \omega + i\partial\bar\partial(\lambda_\theta + \rho(s,t)).$$

Thus, $\rho(s=0,t=0)=0$,

$$\frac{d}{dt}|_{t=0}\rho(s,t) = u \text{ and } \frac{d}{ds}|_{s=0}\rho(s,t) = v.$$

Differentiating (4.34) on s again,

$$(\triangle_{\lambda_\theta+\rho(s,t)}+1)\frac{\partial^2\rho(s,t)}{\partial s\partial t} =< \partial\bar\partial\frac{\partial\rho(s,t)}{\partial s}, \partial\bar\partial\frac{\partial\rho(s,t)}{\partial t} >_{\lambda_\theta+\rho(s,t)} . \tag{4.37}$$

Then setting $t = s = 0$ and using the second formula in Lemma 3.20, we get

$$\frac{\partial^2 \rho(s,t)}{\partial s \partial t}|_{s=t=0} = \langle \partial u, \partial v \rangle_\theta = \langle \partial v, \partial u \rangle_\theta$$

modulo $Ker(\triangle_\theta + 1)$. Applying integration by parts to (4.36),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial}{\partial t} E(\sigma^*(s,t)\theta; \omega) \\
&= -\int_M \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\rho(s,t)\omega^n_{\lambda_\theta + \rho(s,t)} + \int_M (\lambda_\theta + \rho(s,t))\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\rho(s,t)\omega^n_{\lambda_\theta+\rho(s,t)}.
\end{aligned}$$

We differentiate it again on s,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial^2 E(\sigma^*(s,t)\theta;\omega)}{\partial s \partial t} \\
&= -\int_M \frac{\partial^2}{\partial s \partial t}\rho(s,t)\omega^n_{\lambda_\theta+\rho(s,t)} - \int_M \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\rho(s,t)\triangle_{\lambda_\theta+\rho(s,t)}\frac{\partial}{\partial s}\rho(s,t)\omega^n_{\lambda_\theta+\rho(s,t)} \\
&+ \int_M \frac{\partial^2}{\partial s\partial t}\rho(s,t)\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\rho(s,t)\omega^n_{\lambda_\theta+\rho(s,t)} + \int_M (\lambda_\theta+\rho(s,t))\frac{\partial^2}{\partial s\partial t}\rho(s,t)\omega^n_{\lambda_\theta+\rho(s,t)} \\
&+ \int_M (\lambda_\theta+\rho(s,t))\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\rho(s,t)\triangle_{\lambda_\theta+\rho(s,t)}\frac{\partial}{\partial s}\rho(s,t)\omega^n_{\lambda_\theta+\rho(s,t)}
\end{aligned}$$

and then evaluate at $s = t = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial^2 E(\sigma^*(s,t)\theta;\omega)}{\partial s\partial t}|_{s=t=0} \\
&= -\int_M \frac{\partial^2}{\partial s\partial t}\rho(s,t)|_{s=t=0}\theta^n - \int_M u\triangle_{\lambda_\theta} v\theta^n \\
&+ \int_M \frac{\partial^2}{\partial s\partial t}\rho(s,t)|_{s=t=0}u\theta^n + \int_M \lambda_\theta \frac{\partial^2}{\partial s\partial t}\rho(s,t)|_{s=t=0}\theta^n \\
&+ \int_M \lambda_\theta u\triangle_{\lambda_\theta} v\theta^n \\
&= \int_M uv\theta^n + \int_M \lambda_\theta \frac{\partial^2\rho(s,t)}{\partial s\partial t}|_{s=t=0}\theta^n + \int_M \lambda_\theta u\triangle_\theta v\theta^n.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the formula above and the first identity in this lemma, we rewrite the second term to be

$$\int_M \lambda_\theta \frac{1}{2}[\langle \partial u, \partial v\rangle_\theta + \langle \partial v, \partial u\rangle_\theta]\theta^n.$$

The third term requires the integration by part formula, Lemma 2.1 in Calamai-Zheng [8], while, $\lambda_\theta, u, v \in C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$,

$$\int_M \lambda_\theta \frac{1}{2}[v\triangle_\theta u + u\triangle_\theta v]\theta^n.$$

Thus, adding these terms together, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} &RHS \\ &= \int_M uv\theta^n + \int_M \lambda_\theta \frac{1}{2}[\langle \partial u, \partial v\rangle_\theta + \langle \partial v, \partial u\rangle_\theta]\theta^n \\ &+ \int_M \lambda_\theta \frac{1}{2}[v\triangle_\theta u + u\triangle_\theta v]\theta^n. \end{aligned}$$

In conclusion, the second identity in the lemma follows directly. □

4.6. **Bifurcation at $t = 1$.** The following existence, uniqueness and regularity of the linear equation with respect to the Kähler cone metrics in Calamai-Zheng [8] is fundamental when applying the implicit function theorem. The general linear elliptic equation was considered,

$$\begin{cases} Lv &= g^{i\bar{j}}v_{i\bar{j}} + b^i v_i + cv = f + \partial_i h^i \text{ in } X \setminus D, \\ v &= v_0 \text{ on } \partial X \end{cases} \tag{4.38}$$

in the pair (X, D). Here ∂X is the boundary of X, $g^{i\bar{j}}$ is the inverse matrix of a C^α_β Kähler cone metric ω and suitable conditions on the coefficients b^i, c, f, h^i, v_0 are given. Note that both b^i and $\partial_i h^i$ are understood as vectors (not functions).

In [8], the general linear elliptic equation was solved on the manifolds with boundary. and the proof used Schauder estimate in Donaldson [16]. But here we only need the theory on the manifolds without boundary and the coefficients

$$b^i = h^i = 0, c = 1 \text{ and } f \in C^\alpha_\beta. \tag{4.39}$$

I.e.

$$Lv = g^{i\bar{j}}v_{i\bar{j}} + v = f \text{ in } M. \tag{4.40}$$

The following is from Proposition 5.21 in [8].

Proposition 4.16. *There exists a unique $C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$ solution of* (4.40) *with data as* (4.39)*.*

Now we continue our proof of the bifurcation.

Proposition 4.17. *Let $\theta = \omega_{\lambda_\theta}$ be the minimum of $E(\cdot;\omega)$ and be the end point of the continuity path i.e. $\varphi(1) = \lambda_\theta$. If Hessian of $E(\cdot;\omega)$ at θ is strictly positive definite, i.e.$D^2E_\theta(u,u) \geq \epsilon\int_M u^2\theta^n$ for some $\epsilon > 0$, then there exists $\delta > 0$ such that the continuity path is solvable for any $t \in (1-\delta, 1]$.*

Proof. We now write the continuity path as the fully non-linear operator from $C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$ to C^α_β,

$$\Phi(t,\varphi) = \log\frac{\omega^n_\varphi}{\omega^n} + t\varphi - \mathfrak{f}.$$

We denote H_θ the kernel space of the linearisation operator

$$L_\theta = \triangle_\theta + id.$$

The whole space $C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$ is decomposed into the direct sum of H_θ and its orthogonal space $H_\theta^\perp$. From Lemma 4.15, $\lambda_\theta \in H_\theta^\perp$.

The path $\varphi - \lambda_\theta$ is decomposed into

$$\varphi - \lambda_\theta = \varphi^\parallel + \varphi^\perp.$$

While, we let P denote the projection from $C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$ to H_θ and decompose the linear operator Φ into two parts.

We first consider the vertical part,

$$\Phi^\perp(t, \varphi^\parallel, \varphi^\perp) = (1-P)[\log \frac{\omega^n_{\lambda_\theta+\varphi^\parallel+\varphi^\perp}}{\omega^n} - \mathfrak{f}] + t \cdot (\lambda_\theta + \varphi^\perp).$$

It vanishes at

$$(t, \varphi^\parallel, \varphi^\perp) = (1, 0, 0),$$

since θ is a Kähler-Einstein cone metric. Meanwhiles, its derivative on $\varphi^\perp$ at $(1,0,0)$ is for any $u \in H_\theta^\perp$,

$$\delta_{\varphi^\perp}\Phi^\perp|_{(1,0,0)}(u) = \triangle_\theta u + u,$$

which is invertible from $H_\theta^\perp$ to itself, since L_θ is a self-adjoint operator. From Proposition 4.16, the linearised equation has uniques $C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$ solution. Therefore, we are able to use the implicit function theorem on $C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$ space to conclude that there is small neighbourhood U near

$$(t, \varphi^\parallel) = (1, 0)$$

such that

$$\varphi^\perp : U \subset (1-\tau, 1] \times H_\theta \to H_\theta^\perp,$$
$$(t, \varphi^\parallel) = \varphi^\perp(t, \varphi^\parallel)$$

solves

$$\Phi^\perp(t, \varphi^\parallel, \varphi^\perp(t, \varphi^\parallel)) = 0$$

when $(t, \varphi^\parallel) \in U$. Furthermore,

$$\varphi^\perp(1, 0) = 0.$$

We further compute the full derivative of $\Phi^\perp$ at $(t, \varphi^\parallel) = (1, 0)$. Let $\varphi^\parallel(s) \in U$ with parameter $0 \le s \le 0$ and

$$\varphi^\parallel(s=0) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial \varphi^\parallel}{\partial s}|_{s=0} = u. \tag{4.41}$$

Since $L_\varphi(\frac{\partial \varphi^\parallel}{\partial s}) = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \frac{\partial \Phi^\perp}{\partial s} &= (1-P)[\triangle_\varphi(\frac{\partial \varphi^\parallel}{\partial s} + \delta_{\varphi^\parallel}\varphi^\perp(\frac{\partial \varphi^\parallel}{\partial s})) + t \cdot \delta_{\varphi^\parallel}\varphi^\perp(\frac{\partial \varphi^\parallel}{\partial s})] \\ &= (1-P)[-\frac{\partial \varphi^\parallel}{\partial s} + \triangle_\varphi(\delta_{\varphi^\parallel}\varphi^\perp(\frac{\partial \varphi^\parallel}{\partial s})) + t \cdot \delta_{\varphi^\parallel}\varphi^\perp(\frac{\partial \varphi^\parallel}{\partial s})] \end{aligned}$$

and at $s=0$, $t=1$,

$$0=\frac{\partial\Phi^{\perp}}{\partial s}=(1-P)[L_{\theta}(\delta_{\varphi^{\parallel}}\varphi^{\perp}|_{(1,0)}(u))].$$

Since both the imagine of $1-P$ and L_{θ} are in $H_{\theta}^{\perp}$, and

$$\delta_{\varphi^{\parallel}}\varphi^{\perp}:U\subset(1-\tau,1]\times H_{\theta}\to H_{\theta}^{\perp},$$

we conclude

$$\delta_{\varphi^{\parallel}}\varphi^{\perp}|_{(1,0)}(u)=0,\forall u\in H_{\theta}. \tag{4.42}$$

Meanwhile,

$$\frac{\partial\Phi^{\perp}}{\partial t}|_{(1,0)}=(\triangle_{\theta}+1)\frac{\partial\varphi^{\perp}}{\partial t}|_{(1,0)}+\lambda_{\theta}=0. \tag{4.43}$$

Here we use the fact that $L_{\theta}(\frac{\partial\varphi^{\parallel}(t)}{\partial t})=0$ when $\varphi^{\parallel}(t)\in H_{\theta}$.

We next consider the horizontal operator on the finite dimensional space H_{θ},

$$\Phi^{\parallel}(t,\varphi^{\parallel})=P[\log\frac{\omega_{\lambda_{\theta}+\varphi^{\parallel}+\varphi^{\perp}(t,\varphi^{\parallel})}^{n}}{\omega^{n}}-\mathfrak{f}]+t\cdot\varphi^{\parallel}.$$

From above, $\frac{\partial\Phi^{\parallel}}{\partial t}|_{(1,0)}=0$. Also, $\Phi^{\parallel}$ vanishes at $t=1$ for any $\varphi^{\parallel}\in H_{\theta}$, i.e.

$$\Phi^{\parallel}(1,\varphi^{\parallel})=0,$$

since at $t=1$, all Kähler-Einstein cone metrics are the solution of the nonlinear equation. Then we consider the modified functional

$$\tilde{\Phi}^{\parallel}(t,\varphi^{\parallel})=\frac{\Phi^{\parallel}(t,\varphi^{\parallel})}{t-1}.$$

We could see that as $t\to1$,

$$\tilde{\Phi}^{\parallel}(1,\varphi^{\parallel})=\frac{\partial\Phi^{\parallel}}{\partial t}=P[\triangle_{\varphi}\frac{\partial\varphi^{\perp}}{\partial t}]+\varphi^{\parallel}.$$

Again, we use the family of $\varphi^{\parallel}(s)$ defined in (4.41), its derivative on $\varphi^{\parallel}$ is

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial s}\tilde{\Phi}^{\parallel}(1,\varphi^{\parallel}(s))=-P<\partial\bar{\partial}\frac{\partial\varphi^{\parallel}}{\partial s}+\delta_{\varphi^{\parallel}}\varphi^{\perp}\cdot\frac{\partial\varphi^{\parallel}}{\partial s},\partial\bar{\partial}\frac{\partial\varphi^{\perp}}{\partial t}>+\frac{\partial\varphi^{\parallel}}{\partial s}. \tag{4.44}$$

Then let this derivative evaluates at $s=0$ and use (4.42) to the first term, we have for any $u\in H_{\theta}$,

$$(\delta_{\varphi^{\parallel}}\tilde{\Phi}^{\parallel})|_{(1,0)}(u)=(\delta_{\varphi^{\parallel}}\frac{\partial\Phi^{\parallel}}{\partial t})|_{(1,0)}(u)=-P<\partial\bar{\partial}\frac{\partial\varphi^{\perp}}{\partial t}|_{(1,0)},\partial\bar{\partial}u>_{\theta}+u. \tag{4.45}$$

So for any $v\in H_{\theta}$,

$$(\delta_{\varphi^{\parallel}}\tilde{\Phi}^{\parallel}|_{(1,0)}(u),v)_{L^{2}(\theta)}=\int_{M}uv-v<\partial\bar{\partial}\frac{\partial\varphi^{\perp}}{\partial t}|_{(1,0)},\partial\bar{\partial}u>_{\theta}\theta^{n}.$$

We apply (3.56), (4.43) and the proof of Lemma 4.15,

$$\begin{aligned} RHS &= \int_M uv + [uv - < \partial u, \partial v >_\theta](\triangle_\theta + 1)\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\varphi^\perp|_{(1,0)}\theta^n \\ &= \int_M uv - [uv - < \partial u, \partial v >_\theta] \cdot \lambda_\theta \cdot \theta^n \\ &= D^2E_\theta(u, v). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, from Lemma 4.15

$$D^2E_\theta(u, v) = \int_M (1 + \frac{1}{2}\triangle_\theta\lambda_\theta) \cdot u \cdot v \cdot \theta^n.$$

From the assumption that Hessian of $E(\cdot;\omega)$ at θ is strictly positive definite, i.e.

$$D^2E_\theta(u, u) \geq \epsilon \int_M u^2\theta^n.$$

Since $u \in H_\theta$, i.e. $\triangle_\theta u = -u$, noting that $u \in C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$, we get by integration by parts,

$$\int_M |\partial u|^2_\theta\theta^n = \int_M u^2\theta^n. \tag{4.46}$$

Thus the bilinear form D^2E_θ is coercive on the Hilbert space H_θ under the norm $W^{1,2}(\theta)$. Actually, H_θ is finite dimensional, since its element is ono-to-one corresponding to the holomorphic vector field and the set of holomorphic vector fields is finite dimensional. Meanwhile, there exists a constant C depending on θ such that,

$$D^2E_\theta(u, v) \leq C||u||_{W^{1,2}(\theta)} \cdot ||v||_{W^{1,2}(\theta)}$$

for all $u, v \in H_\theta$. Then the Lax-Milgram theorem implies there is a unique weak solution $u_w \in H_\theta$ such that

$$D^2E_\theta(u_w, v) =< w, v >_{W^{1,2}(\theta)}$$

for all $w, v \in H_\theta$. The regularity of u_w is achieved by first applying the Hanarck inequality (Proposition 5.12 in [8]), then using Donaldson's Schauder estimate. Therefore, from the relation

$$(\delta_{\varphi^\parallel}\tilde{\Phi}^\parallel|_{(1,0)}(u), v)_{L^2(\theta)} = D^2E_\theta(u, v),$$

the linearisation operator $\delta_{\varphi^\parallel}\tilde{\Phi}^\parallel|_{(1,0)}$ is invertible from H_θ to itself.

Then we are able to apply the implicit function theorem to $\tilde{\Phi}^\parallel(t, \varphi^\parallel)$ over $C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$ to find a solution $\varphi^\parallel(t) \in C^{2,\alpha}_\beta$ with $t \in (1 - \tau, 1]$ such that

- $\tilde{\Phi}^\parallel(t, \varphi^\parallel(t)) = 0$,
- $\varphi(1) = 0$.

Thus the original nonlinear equation is solved as

$$\Phi^\perp(t, \varphi^\parallel(t), \varphi^\perp(t, \varphi^\parallel(t))) = 0.$$

And moreover,

$$\varphi(t) = \lambda_\theta + \varphi^{\|}(t) + \varphi^{\perp}(t, \varphi^{\|}(t))$$

is the solution to the continuity path on $t \in (1-\tau, 1]$ with

$$\varphi(1) = \lambda_\theta.$$

□

4.7. **Proof of the main theorem.**

Proof. The proof is paralleling to Bando-Mabuchi [1]. We are given a Kähler cone metric ω. We assume that there are two orbits $\mathcal{O}_1$ and $\mathcal{O}_2$. We minimise $E(\cdot, \omega)$ at θ_1 in $\mathcal{O}_1$, consider the linear segment

$$\omega_1^\epsilon = (1-\epsilon)\omega + \epsilon\theta_1.$$

We let $E^\epsilon = E(\cdot, \omega_1^\epsilon)$. Since

$$\theta_1 = \omega + i\partial\bar{\partial}\lambda_{\theta_1} = \omega_1^\epsilon + i\partial\bar{\partial}\lambda_{\theta_1}^\epsilon = (1-\epsilon)\omega + \epsilon\theta_1 + i\partial\bar{\partial}\lambda_{\theta_1}^\epsilon,$$

we have $\lambda_{\theta_1}^\epsilon = (1-\epsilon)\lambda_{\theta_1}$. So

$$\begin{aligned} D^2E_{\theta_1}(u,v) &= \int_M (1 + \frac{1}{2}\triangle_{\theta_1}\lambda_{\theta_1}^\epsilon)\cdot u \cdot v \cdot \theta_1^n \\ &= (1-\epsilon)\int_M (1 + \frac{1}{2}\triangle_{\theta_1}\lambda_{\theta_1})\cdot u\cdot v\cdot\theta_1^n + \epsilon\int_M u\cdot v\cdot\theta_1^n. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$D^2E_{\theta_1}^\epsilon(u,u) = (1-\epsilon)D^2E_{\theta_1}(u,u) + \epsilon\int_M u^2\theta_1^n > 0.$$

Here $D^2E_{\theta_1}(u,u)$ is non-negative, since θ_1 is the global minimum in $\mathcal{O}_1$.

Then we minimise $E(\cdot;\omega_1^\epsilon)$ at θ_2 in $\mathcal{O}_2$, consider the linear segment

$$\omega_2^\epsilon = (1-\epsilon)\omega_1^\epsilon + \epsilon\theta_2$$

and let $E_2^\epsilon = E(\cdot, \omega_2^\epsilon)$. Again, $D^2(E_2^\epsilon)_{\theta_2}(u,u)$ is also strictly positive definite.

So, choose ω_2^ϵ to be sufficient close to ω_1^ϵ and choose θ_1^ϵ to be also close to θ_1. Then $D^2(E_2^\epsilon)_{\theta_1^\epsilon}(u,u)$ is again strictly positive definite.

We now are able to construct two continuity paths connecting ω_2^ϵ to both θ_1^ϵ and θ^2, according to the bifurcation (Proposition 4.17), the openness (Proposition 4.1) and the apriori estimates (Section 4.3). But again, the openness (Proposition 4.1) implies the solution has to be unique so $\mathcal{O}_1 = \mathcal{O}_2$. □

References

[1] Shigetoshi Bando and Toshiki Mabuchi, *Uniqueness of Einstein Kähler metrics modulo connected group actions*, Algebraic geometry, Sendai, 1985, Adv. Stud. Pure Math., vol. 10, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1987, pp. 11–40.

[2] Robert Berman, Sébastien Boucksom, Philippe Eyssidieux, Vincent Guedj, and Ahmed Zeriahi, *Kähler-Einstein metrics and the Kähler-Ricci flow on log Fano varieties*, arXiv:1111.7158.

[3] Bo Berndtsson, *An introduction to things $\bar{\partial}$*, IAS/Park City Mathematics Series (2008).

[4] ———, *L^2 extension of $\bar{\partial}$ closed forms*, arXiv:1104.4620.

[5] ———, *A Brunn-Minkowski type inequality for Fano manifolds and some uniqueness theorems in Kähler geometry*, Invent. Math. **200** (2015), no. 1, 149–200.

[6] Z. Blocki, *Cauchy - Riemann meet Monge-Ampère*, Bulletin of Mathematical Sciences **4** (2014), no. 3, 433-480.

[7] Simon Brendle, *Ricci flat Kähler metrics with edge singularities*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN **24** (2013), 5727–5766.

[8] Simone Calamai and Kai Zheng, *Geodesics in the space of Kähler cone metrics, I*, Amer. J. Math. **137** (2015), no. 5, 1149–1208.

[9] Jeff Cheeger and Tobias H. Colding, *On the structure of spaces with Ricci curvature bounded below. II*, J. Differential Geom. **54** (2000), no. 1, 13–35.

[10] Ivan A. Cheltsov and Yanir A. Rubinstein, *Asymptotically log Fano varieties*, Adv. Math. **285** (2015), 1241–1300.

[11] Xiuxiong Chen, Simon Donaldson, and Song Sun, *Kähler-Einstein metrics on Fano manifolds. I: Approximation of metrics with cone singularities*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **28** (2015), no. 1, 183–197.

[12] ———, *Kähler-Einstein metrics on Fano manifolds. II: Limits with cone angle less than 2π*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **28** (2015), no. 1, 199–234.

[13] ———, *Kähler-Einstein metrics on Fano manifolds. III: Limits as cone angle approaches 2π and completion of the main proof*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **28** (2015), no. 1, 235–278.

[14] Xiuxiong Chen and Yuanqi Wang, *On the regularity problem of complex Monge-Ampère equations with conical singularities*, arXiv:1405.1021.

[15] Christopher B. Croke, *Some isoperimetric inequalities and eigenvalue estimates*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **13** (1980), no. 4, 419–435.

[16] S. K. Donaldson, *Kähler metrics with cone singularities along a divisor*, Essays in mathematics and its applications, Springer, Heidelberg, 2012, pp. 49–79.

[17] Sylvestre Gallot, *Inégalités isopérimétriques et analytiques sur les variétés riemanniennes*, Astérisque **163-164** (1988), 5–6, 31–91, 281 (1989) (French, with English summary). On the geometry of differentiable manifolds (Rome, 1986).

[18] ———, *Isoperimetric inequalities based on integral norms of Ricci curvature*, Astérisque **157-158** (1988), 191–216. Colloque Paul Lévy sur les Processus Stochastiques (Palaiseau, 1987).

[19] David Gilbarg and Neil S. Trudinger, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, Classics in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. Reprint of the 1998 edition.

[20] Henri Guenancia and Mihai Păun, *Conic singularities metrics with prescribed Ricci curvature: the case of general cone angles along normal crossing divisors*, arXiv:1307.6375.

[21] L. Hörmander, *Introduction to Complex Analysis in Several Variables*, North-Holland, 1990.

[22] Saïd Ilias, *Constantes explicites pour les inégalités de Sobolev sur les variétés riemanniennes compactes*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **33** (1983), no. 2, 151–165 (French).
[23] T. Jeffres, Rafe Mazzeo, and Y. Rubinstein, *Kähler-Einstein metrics with edge singularities*, arXiv:1105.5216.
[24] Sławomir Kołodziej, *The complex Monge-Ampère equation*, Acta Math. **180** (1998), no. 1, 69–117.
[25] Haozhao Li and Kai Zheng, *Kähler non-collapsing, eigenvalues and the Calabi flow*, J. Funct. Anal. **267** (2014), no. 5, 1593–1636.
[26] Long Li, *On the Spectrum of weighted Laplacian operator and its application to uniqueness of Kähler-Einstein metrics*, Mathematische Annalen **362** (2014), no. 3, 1349-1378.
[27] ———, *On the uniqueness of Kähler-Einstein cone metrics*, arXiv 1402.4049.
[28] Jian Song and Xiaowei Wang, *The greatest Ricci lower bound, conical Einstein metrics and the Chern number inequality*, arXiv:1207.4839.
[29] Gang Tian, *Kähler-Einstein metrics with positive scalar curvature*, Invent. Math. **130** (1997), no. 1, 1–37.
[30] Gang Tian and Xiaohua Zhu, *Uniqueness of Kähler-Ricci solitons*, Acta Math. **184** (2000), no. 2, 271–305.
[31] Shing Tung Yau, *A general Schwarz lemma for Kähler manifolds*, Amer. J. Math. **100** (1978), no. 1, 197–203.
[32] ———, *On the Ricci curvature of a compact Kähler manifold and the complex Monge-Ampère equation. I*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **31** (1978), no. 3, 339–411.
[33] Kai Zheng, *Kähler metrics with cone singularities and uniqueness problem*, Proceedings of the 9th ISAAC Congress, Kraków 2013, Current Trends in Analysis and its Applications, Trends in Mathematics, Springer International Publishing, 2015, pp. 395-408.

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, McMaster University, 1280 Main Street West, Hamilton, ON L8S 4K1, Canada
E-mail address, Long Li: lilong@math.mcmaster.ca

Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, UK
E-mail address, Kai Zheng: K.Zheng@warwick.ac.uk